

the characters were husband and wife. This Negro teacher cast a little white girl in the role of the wife, and a Negro boy in the role of the husband. A few weeks ago a worried father told me that a Negro boy tried to kiss his daughter in the school; that she was able to fight him off, but he did succeed in kissing her girl companion.

One parent of a daughter in one of the Washington schools brought me valentines from a Negro boy to his daughter, and valentines from another Negro boy to another white girl in the same school.

In one of the schools a white girl married a Negro boy who previously attended the same school with her.

In Washington schools today there is being carried on a revolting, systematic, progressive, disgusting campaign of race amalgamation. The situation is not improved. These conditions will develop anywhere under the same circumstances.

The pregnancy situation in the junior and senior high schools is so acute that on the 6th day of May the District Congress of Parents and Teachers adopted a resolution calling for a special education program to insure continued schooling for the many pregnant students of the Washington school system. In that connection, the District of Columbia public health reports show that more than one out of every four Negroes born

in Washington is an illegitimate child. This is the atmosphere and these are the conditions to which white boys and girls are subjected in the Washington integrated schools.

To bring the school situation up to date, on Wednesday, May 11, one member of the District of Columbia School Board proposed an ultimatum to require the temporary teachers—who make up about one-fourth of the teaching force—to qualify for certification or leave the system. He said he would rather have double-sized classes taught by qualified teachers than to retain incompetents. On the same day the proposal was also made to increase the compulsory school attendance age in the District from 16 years to 21 years. The reason given for that extraordinary proposal was that children who dropped out of high school at the age of 16 tend to drift into delinquency, often do not become self-supporting, and, more significantly, give birth to those who follow the same pattern of life. The situation, instead of being the "miracle of social adjustment" claimed by the Superintendent of Schools, is bad and is growing worse.

The school problem has reached the stage where the people of Virginia must soon determine whether they will permit the miserable conditions now prevailing in Washington to spill over into Virginia, whether this

NAACP-sponsored plot will succeed to transfer control of the public schools system from the State to the Federal Government. I believe that the Virginians of today will make no decision which will stamp them as being unworthy descendants of their revered forebears, Washington, Jefferson, Lee, Madison, Marshall, Henry, Randolph, Monroe, Mason, and other patriots of the Old Dominion, so proudly acclaimed by the Nation at large. I believe that we of this generation will no more accept oppression or dictatorship than they did.

In carrying on the battle to preserve the principle of States rights we are not fighting for any mere slogan. Local self-government is the guarantee of individual liberty, which is the highest aim of all government.

This principle which has come down to us through the ages rings as loudly in our ears as it ever did in theirs, that "resistance to tyranny is obedience to God."

Plato said many years ago that the penalty good men pay for indifference to public affairs is to be ruled by evil men. Edmund Burke said many generations later that all that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.

The lessons of history are before us to read. Our fight is ahead of us, not behind us. If we do our part, with faith in Almighty God, we will win it.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1959

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 4: 8: *We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair.*

O Thou eternal Spirit of the living God, inspire us during this day with a vivid assurance of Thy divine guidance in our search and struggles to find the right solution to life's varied and difficult problems.

Grant that through the discipline of hard experiences and trying circumstances we may learn the needed lessons of patience and perseverance.

May we never yield to moods of defeatism and despair and allow our energies and resources to be weakened and dissipated by fears and anxieties.

Give us the unfaltering confidence that there is a moral and spiritual power in the universe which is working for righteousness and justice, however seemingly frail and feeble our own human efforts and achievements.

Hear us through the merits and mediation of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

SENATE RESOLUTION 124

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. John Foster Dulles, a former Senator from the State of New York, and a former Secretary of State.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 19. An act to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard.

APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1960 FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night, that is May 28, to file two reports—one on the appropriation bill for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1960 and the other on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask when it is proposed to bring these bills up?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that the legislative appropriation bill will be programed for Monday, and the Defense Department appropriation bill for Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. I ask this because we need a little time to find out what is in these bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the gentleman from Iowa to know that I have no controversy with him at all or with his

inquiring mind in this respect, but I am simply answering the gentleman's question to say that it is the intention to program the legislative appropriation bill for Monday and to program the Defense Department appropriation bill for Tuesday and Wednesday. Of course, if the gentleman from Iowa wants to inquire when the bills will be available and the reports and so forth, that is another question.

Mr. GROSS. Can the defense bill be taken up Wednesday so that we might have some time?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention to bring the Defense Department appropriation bill up on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. That does not leave very much time, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. You would have 6 days on the defense bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on both bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Betts Boggs Bonner Bray Brooks, La. Casey Downing Durham Fogarty Hall | Harris Hiestand Holland Johnson, Md. Jones, Mo. Kearns Laird Landrum Mason O'Konski | Perkins Pillion Reece, Tenn. Spence Taylor Teague, Tex. Watts Withrow |
|--|--|--|

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] to recommit the bill H.R. 7176, the general Government matters appropriation bill for 1960.

Without objection, the Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with the recommendation that the committee report the bill forthwith with the following amendment: On page 5, line 10, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following language: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be spent in violation of the provisions of section 209."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 229, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—171

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Abbt Abernethy Adair Alexander Alford Alger Andersen, Minn. Anderson, Mont. Ashley Ashmore Bailey Barden Barr Barrett Beckworth Bennett, Fla. Bennett, Mich. Berry Blatnik Blitch Bosch Bow Bray Breeding Brewster Brook Brooks, Tex. Broomfield Brown, Ohio Budge Burdick Burleson Byrne, Pa. Carter Cederberg Chelf Church Clark | Coad Collier Colmer Cunningham Daniels Davis, Ga. Dent Derwinski Devine Dingell Dooley Dorn, S.C. Dowdy Doyle Dulski Fallon Fascell Feighan Flynn Foley Fountain Frazier Friedel Gathings George Granahan Grant Green, Oreg. Green, Pa. Griffiths Gross Haley Hardy Hargis Harrison Hechler Hemphill Henderson Hoffman, Ill. | Hoffman, Mich. Hogan Hollifield Holt Jennings Johansen Johnson, Calif. Johnson, Colo. Johnson, Wis. Kasem Kee Kilday Kilgore King, Calif. Kitchin Knox Kowalski Langen Lankford Lennen Lesinski Lipscomb McDonough McGinley McMillan McSweeney Macdonald Machrowicz Mack, Ill. Martin Matthews Meader Metcalf Meyer Miller Clem Miller George P. Monagan Morris, N. Mex. |
|---|--|---|

Moss
 Nix
 Norrell
 O'Hara, Mich.
 Oliver
 Frost
 Poage
 Poff
 Porter
 Prokop
 Rains
 Randall
 Reuss
 Rhodes, Ariz.
 Rhodes, Pa.
 Rivers, Alaska
 Rogers, Fla.
 Rogers, Tex.
 Roush

Addonizio
 Albert
 Allen
 Andrews
 Arenas
 Aspinall
 Auchincloss
 Avery
 Ayres
 Baker
 Baldwin
 Baring
 Barry
 Bass, N.H.
 Bass, Tenn.
 Bates
 Baumhart
 Becker
 Belcher
 Bentley
 Boland
 Bolling
 Bolton
 Bowles
 Boyle
 Brademas
 Brooks, La.
 Brown, Ga.
 Brown, Mo.
 Broyhill
 Buckley
 Burke, Ky.
 Burke, Mass.
 Bush
 Byrnes, Wis.
 Cahill
 Canfield
 Cannon
 Carnahan
 Celler
 Chamberlain
 Chenoweth
 Chipfield
 Coffin
 Cohelan
 Conte
 Cook
 Cooley
 Corbett
 Cramer
 Curtin
 Curtis, Mass.
 Curtis, Mo.
 Daddario
 Dague
 Davis, Tenn.
 Dawson
 Delaney
 Denton
 Derounian
 Diggs
 Dixon
 Dollinger
 Donohue
 Dorn, N.Y.
 Downing
 Dwyer
 Edmondson
 Elliott
 Everett
 Evins
 Farbstien
 Fenton
 Fisher
 Flood
 Forand

Ford
 Forrester
 Frelinghuysen
 Fulton
 Gallagher
 Gary
 Gavin
 Gialmo
 Gray
 Griffin
 Gubser
 Hagen
 Halleck
 Halpern
 Harmon
 Hays
 Healey
 Herbert
 Herlong
 Hess
 Hoeven
 Holtzman
 Horan
 Hosmer
 Huddleston
 Hull
 Ikard
 Irwin
 Jackson
 Jarman
 Jensen
 Jonas
 Jones, Ala.
 Jones, Ala.
 Judd
 Karsten
 Karth
 Kastenmeier
 Keith
 Kelly
 Keogh
 Kilburn
 King, Utah
 Kirwan
 Klucznyski
 Lafore
 Lane
 Latta
 Levering
 Libonati
 Lindsay
 Loser
 McCormack
 McCulloch
 McDowell
 McFall
 McGovern
 McIntire
 Mack, Wash.
 Madden
 Magnuson
 Mahon
 Mailliard
 Marshall
 May
 Merrow
 Michel
 Miller, N.Y.
 Milliken
 Mills
 Minshall
 Mitchell
 Montoya
 Moore
 Moorhead
 Morris, Okla.
 Morrison
 Moulder

NAYS—229

Multer
 Mumma
 Murphy
 Murray
 Natcher
 Nelsen
 Norblad
 O'Brien, Ill.
 O'Brien, N.Y.
 O'Hara, Ill.
 O'Neill
 Osmer
 Ostertag
 Passman
 Patman
 Pelly
 Philbin
 Pilcher
 Pirnie
 Powell
 Preston
 Price
 Pucinski
 Quile
 Quigley
 Rabaut
 Ray
 Rees, Kans.
 Riehlman
 Riley
 Roberts
 Robison
 Rodino
 Rogers, Colo.
 Rogers, Mass.
 Rooney
 Roosevelt
 Rostenkowski
 St. George
 Saund
 Schenck
 Schwengel
 Selden
 Shelley
 Sheppard
 Sikes
 Simpson, Pa.
 Sisk
 Springer
 Steed
 Stubblefield
 Taber
 Thomas
 Thompson, La.
 Thompson, N.J.
 Thornberry
 Tollefson
 Trimble
 Udall
 Van Pelt
 Van Zandt
 Vinson
 Wainwright
 Walhauser
 Walter
 Weaver
 Weiss
 Westland
 Widnall
 Willis
 Wilson
 Yates
 Younger
 Zablocki
 Zelenko

NOT VOTING—33

Durham
 Fogarty
 Garmatz
 Glenn
 Hall
 Harris
 Hiestand
 Holland
 Johnson, Md.
 Jones, Mo.
 Kearns
 Laird

Thompson, Tex.
 Thomson, Wyo.
 Toll
 Tuck
 Ullman
 Utt
 Vanik
 Wampler
 Wharton
 Whitener
 Whitten
 Wier
 Williams
 Winstead
 Wolf
 Wright
 Young

Landrum
Mason
Moeller
Morgan
O'Konski

Perkins
 Pillion
 Reece, Tenn.
 Rivers, E.C.
 Siler

Spence
 Staggers
 Taylor
 Watts
 Withrow

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hiestand for, with Mr. Morgan against.
 Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
 Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Boggs against.
 Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
 Mr. Moeller for, with Mr. Betts against.
 Mr. Johnson of Maryland for, with Mr. Kearns against.
 Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holland with Mr. Glenn.
 Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Withrow.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Siler.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Pillion.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Harris with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ADDONIZIO, Mr. MOULDER, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. BARRY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1960

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of the bill H.R. 7343, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, on which a separate vote is demanded.

Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: On page 19, line 20, immediately preceding "For" insert the following: "For construction of a maximum security institution on a site to be selected by the Attorney General, \$2,000,000."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 266, nays 133, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—266

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Abbt Abernethy Addonizio Albert Alford Allen Anderson, Mont. Ashley Ashmore Ayres Bailey Baker Baldwin | Baring Barr Barrett Barry Bass, Tenn. Beckworth Bennett, Fla. Bennett, Mich. Blatnik Blitch Boland Bolling Bowles Boyle | Brademas Breeding Brewster Brook Brooks, La. Brooks, Tex. Brown, Ga. Broyhill Buckley Burdick Burke, Ky. Burke, Mass. Burleson Byrne, Pa. |
|---|--|--|

Carnahan
Carter
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chipperfield
Church
Clark
Coad
Coffin
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cook
Cooley
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn, N.Y.
Dorn, S.C.
Doyle
Dulski
Edmondson
Elliot
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fasell
Feighan
Fisner
Flynn
Flynt
Foley
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Gathings
Gavin
George
Giaino
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagen
Haley
Halpern
Hardy
Hargis
Harmon
Harris
Harrison
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill

Herlong
Hoffman, Ill.
Hogan
Hollifield
Holtzman
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kasem
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Levering
Libonati
Lindsay
Loser
McCormack
McDowell
McFall
McGinley
McGovern
McMillan
McSweeney
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Matthews
Morrow
Metcalf
Meyer
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller
George P.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Morris, Okla.
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill
Oliver
Osmer
Passman

Patman
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Preston
Price
Prokop
Pucinski
Rabaut
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Santangelo
Saund
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Wampler
Weis
Whitener
Wier
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

Marshall
Martin
May
Meador
Milkken
Minshall
Moore
Mumma
Murray
Natcher
Neelsen
Norblad
Ostertag
Pelly
Poff
Porter
Quie

Quigley
Ray
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robison
Rooney
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Sullivan

Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Wainwright
Wallhauser
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Widnall
Willson
Younger

NOT VOTING—34

Anfuso
Aspinall
Betts
Boggs
Bonner
Boykin
Casey
Downing
Durham
Fogarty
Garmatz
Glenn

Hall
Hiestand
Holland
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Mo.
Kearns
Laird
Landrum
Mason
Moeller
Morgan
O'Konski

Perkins
Pillion
Reece, Tenn.
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Mass.
Siler
Spence
Taylor
Watts
Withrow

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Moeller against.
Mr. Holland for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Betts for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.
Mr. Johnson of Maryland for, with Mr. Hiestand against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Hall with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Durham with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. BAUMHART changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PIRNIE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 34, strike out all of line 11 down through and including line 14.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the event that the House refuses to go on record on a rollcall vote on this appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and other departments and agencies of Government, I want the record to clearly show that I am opposed to it.

While the Appropriations Committee has made commendable cuts in certain items, there is still far too much money proposed to be spent unnecessarily, especially in the light of a \$288 billion Federal debt and the serious situation with which the U.S. Treasury is confronted in funding obligations already existing.

I am irrevocably opposed to contributions of \$48 million to international organizations, plus \$3.8 million for missions and conferences in connection with these international organizations.

I am opposed to the spending of nearly a million dollars, as proposed in this one bill, for liquor and entertainment. This is an unconscionable raid on the taxpayers.

There are a number of other items in this bill which, with those mentioned, should have been drastically reduced or eliminated altogether. I cannot support this kind of legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement.

At 1:15 this afternoon there will be three buses in front of the steps of the Capitol on the House side to take Members who desire to attend the funeral services of the late John Foster Dulles at the Washington Cathedral, and from there to return to the House.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the motion to recommit by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] on the bill (H.R. 7086) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7086 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 1, line 7, strike out "June 30, 1963" and insert "September 30, 1961."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

NAYS—133

Adair
Alexander
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Andrews
Arends
Auchincloss
Avery
Barden
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Baumhart
Becker
Belcher
Bentley
Berry
Bolton
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Mo.
Brown, Ohio
Budge
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill

Canfield
Cannon
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Derounian
Devine
Dixon
Dowdy
Dwyer
Fenton
Fino
Flood
Ford
Fulton
Gary
Gross
Gubser
Halleck
Henderson
Hess

Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Holt
Horan
Hosmer
Jackson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Judd
Karth
Keith
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kirwan
Knox
Lafore
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
Mack, Wash.
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 153, nays 246, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]
YEAS—153

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adair | Dixon | Minshall |
| Alexander | Donohue | Moore |
| Alger | Dooley | Moss |
| Allen | Dorn, N.Y. | Mumma |
| Andersen, | Dwyer | Nelsen |
| Minn. | Fenton | Norblad |
| Arends | Fino | O'Brien, N.Y. |
| Ashmore | Ford | Osmers |
| Auchincloss | Frelinghuysen | Ostertag |
| Avery | Fulton | Pelly |
| Ayres | Gavin | Philbin |
| Baker | Griffin | Pirnie |
| Baldwin | Gross | Poage |
| Barden | Gubser | Poff |
| Barry | Halleck | Quile |
| Bass, N.H. | Halpern | Ray |
| Bates | Henderson | Rees, Kans. |
| Baumhart | Hess | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Becker | Hoeven | Riehlman |
| Belcher | Hoffman, Ill. | Robison |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hoffman, Mich. | Rogers, Mass. |
| Bentley | Holt | Roosevelt |
| Berry | Horan | St. George |
| Bolton | Hosmer | Saylor |
| Bosch | Jackson | Schenck |
| Bow | Jensen | Scherer |
| Breeding | Johansen | Schwengel |
| Broomfield | Jonas | Short |
| Brown, Ohio | Judd | Simpson, Ill. |
| Broyhill | Kasem | Simpson, Pa. |
| Budge | Kastenmeier | Smith, Calif. |
| Burke, Mass. | Keith | Springer |
| Bush | Kilburn | Taber |
| Byrnes, Wis. | King, Calif. | Teague, Calif. |
| Cahill | Knox | Thomson, Wyo. |
| Canfield | Lafore | Tollefson |
| Cederberg | Langen | Utt |
| Chamberlain | Latta | Van Pelt |
| Chenoweth | Lindsay | Van Zandt |
| Chipperfield | Lipscomb | Wallhauser |
| Church | McCulloch | Weaver |
| Coad | McDonough | Wels |
| Conte | McIntire | Westland |
| Corbett | Mack, Wash. | Wharton |
| Cramer | Mailliard | Whitten |
| Curtin | Martin | Widnall |
| Curtis, Mass. | May | Wilson |
| Curtis, Mo. | Meador | Winstead |
| Dague | Morrow | Wolf |
| Derounian | Michel | Younger |
| Derwinski | Miller, N.Y. | |
| Devine | Milliken | |

NAYS—246

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Abbitt | Clark | Frazier |
| Abernethy | Coffin | Friedel |
| Addonizio | Cohelan | Gallagher |
| Albert | Collier | Gary |
| Alford | Colmer | Gathings |
| Anderson, | Cook | George |
| Mont. | Cooley | Gialmo |
| Andrews | Cunningham | Granahan |
| Ashley | Daddario | Grant |
| Aspinall | Daniels | Gray |
| Baring | Davis, Ga. | Green, Oreg. |
| Barr | Davis, Tenn. | Green, Pa. |
| Barrett | Dawson | Griffiths |
| Bass, Tenn. | Delaney | Hagen |
| Beckworth | Dent | Haley |
| Bennett, Fla. | Denton | Hardy |
| Blatnik | Diggs | Hargis |
| Blitch | Dingell | Harmon |
| Boland | Dollinger | Harris |
| Bolling | Dorn, S.C. | Harrison |
| Bowles | Dowdy | Hays |
| Boyle | Doyle | Healey |
| Brademas | Dulski | Hébert |
| Bray | Edmondson | Hechler |
| Brewster | Elliott | Hemphill |
| Brock | Everett | Herlong |
| Brooks, La. | Evins | Hogen |
| Brooks, Tex. | Fallon | Hollifield |
| Brown, Ga. | Farbstein | Holtzman |
| Brown, Mo. | Fascell | Huddleston |
| Burdick | Feighan | Hull |
| Burke, Ky. | Fisher | Ikard |
| Burleson | Flood | Irwin |
| Byrne, Pa. | Flynn | Jarman |
| Cannon | Flynt | Jennings |
| Carnahan | Foley | Johnson, Calif. |
| Carter | Forand | Johnson, Colo. |
| Celler | Forrester | Johnson, Wis. |
| Chelf | Fountain | Jones, Ala. |

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Karsten | Morris, N. Mex. | Saund |
| Karth | Morris, Okla. | Scott |
| Kee | Morrison | Selden |
| Kelly | Moulder | Shelley |
| Keogh | Multer | Sheppard |
| Kilday | Murphy | Shiple |
| Kilgore | Murray | Sikes |
| King, Utah | Natcher | Sisk |
| Kirwan | Nix | Slack |
| Kitchin | Norrell | Smith, Iowa |
| Kluczynski | O'Brien, Ill. | Smith, Miss. |
| Kowalski | O'Hara, Ill. | Smith, Va. |
| Lane | O'Hara, Mich. | Staggers |
| Lankford | O'Neill | Steed |
| Lennon | Oliver | Stratton |
| Lesinski | Passman | Stubblefield |
| Levering | Patman | Sullivan |
| Libonati | Pfost | Teague, Tex. |
| Loser | Pilcher | Teller |
| McCormack | Porter | Thomas |
| McDonnell | Powell | Thompson, La. |
| McFall | Preston | Thompson, N.J. |
| McGinley | Price | Thompson, Tex. |
| McGovern | Prokop | Thornberry |
| McMillan | Pucinski | Toll |
| McSweeney | Quigley | Trimble |
| Mack, Ill. | Rabaut | Tuck |
| Madden | Rains | Udall |
| Magnuson | Randall | Ullman |
| Mahon | Reuss | Vanik |
| Marshall | Rhodes, Pa. | Vinson |
| Matthews | Riley | Wainwright |
| Metcalfe | Rivers, Alaska | Walter |
| Meyer | Rivers, S.C. | Wampler |
| Miller, Clem | Roberts | Whitener |
| Miller, | Rodino | Wier |
| George P. | Rogers, Colo. | Williams |
| Mills | Rogers, Fla. | Willis |
| Mitchell | Rogers, Tex. | Wright |
| Monagan | Rooney | Yates |
| Montoya | Rostenkowski | Young |
| Moorhead | Roush | Zablocki |
| | Rutherford | Zelenko |
| | Santangelo | |

NOT VOTING—34

| | | |
|---------|--------------|--------------|
| Anfuso | Glenn | O'Konski |
| Bailey | Hall | Perkins |
| Betts | Hiestand | Pillion |
| Boggs | Holland | Reece, Tenn. |
| Bonner | Johnson, Md. | Siler |
| Boykin | Jones, Mo. | Smith, Kans. |
| Buckley | Kearns | Spence |
| Casey | Laird | Taylor |
| Downing | Landrum | Watts |
| Durham | Mason | Withrow |
| Fogarty | Moeller | |
| Garmatz | Morgan | |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Morgan against.
Mr. Hiestand for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Betts for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Boggs against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Watts against.
Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Johnson of Maryland against.
Mr. Pillion for, with Mr. Moeller against.
Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Hall against.
Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Holland against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bailey with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Withrow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

[Roll No. 59]

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 382, nays 7, not voting 44, as follows:

YEAS—382

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Abbitt | Adair | Albert |
| Abernethy | Addonizio | Alexander |

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Alford | Dowdy | Lindsay |
| Allen | Doyle | Lipscomb |
| Andersen, | Dulski | Loser |
| Minn. | Dwyer | McCormack |
| Anderson, | Edmondson | McCulloch |
| Mont. | Elliott | McDonough |
| Andrews | Everett | McDonnell |
| Arends | Evins | McFall |
| Ashley | Fallon | McGinley |
| Ashmore | Farbstein | McGovern |
| Aspinall | Fascell | McIntire |
| Auchincloss | Feighan | McMillan |
| Avery | Fenton | McSweeney |
| Ayres | Fino | Macdonald |
| Bailey | Fisher | Macchrowicz |
| Baker | Flood | Mack, Ill. |
| Baldwin | Flynn | Mack, Wash. |
| Barden | Flynt | Madden |
| Baring | Foley | Magnuson |
| Barr | Forand | Mahon |
| Barrett | Ford | Mailliard |
| Barry | Forrester | Marshall |
| Bass, N.H. | Fountain | Martin |
| Bass, Tenn. | Frazier | Matthews |
| Bates | Frelinghuysen | May |
| Baumhart | Friedel | Meador |
| Becker | Fulton | Metcalfe |
| Belcher | Gallagher | Meyer |
| Bennett, Fla. | Gary | Miller, Clem |
| Bennett, Mich. | Gathings | George P. |
| Bentley | Gavin | Miller, N.Y. |
| Berry | George | Milliken |
| Bolton | Gialmo | Mills |
| Bosch | Granahan | Mitchell |
| Bow | Grant | Monagan |
| Breeding | Green, Oreg. | Montoya |
| Broomfield | Green, Pa. | Moore |
| Brown, Ohio | Griffin | Moorhead |
| Broyhill | Griffiths | Morris, N. Mex. |
| Budge | Gross | Morris, Okla. |
| Burke, Mass. | Gubser | Morrison |
| Bush | Hagen | Moss |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Hailey | Moulder |
| Cahill | Halleck | Multer |
| Canfield | Halpern | Mumma |
| Cederberg | Hardy | Murphy |
| Chamberlain | Hargis | Murray |
| Chenoweth | Harmon | Natcher |
| Chipperfield | Harris | Nelson |
| Church | Harrison | Nix |
| Coad | Hays | Norblad |
| Conte | Healey | Norrell |
| Corbett | Hébert | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Cramer | Hechler | O'Brien, N.Y. |
| Curtin | Hemphill | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Curtis, Mass. | Henderson | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Curtis, Mo. | Herlong | O'Neill |
| Dague | Hess | Oliver |
| Derounian | Hoeven | Osmers |
| Derwinski | Hoffman, Ill. | Ostertag |
| Devine | Hogan | Passman |
| | Hollifield | Patman |
| | Holt | Pelly |
| | Holtzman | Pfost |
| | Horan | Philbin |
| | Hosmer | Pilcher |
| | Huddleston | Pirnie |
| | Hull | Poage |
| | Ikard | Poff |
| | Irwin | Porter |
| | Jarman | Powell |
| | Chipperfield | Preston |
| | Church | Price |
| | Clark | Prokop |
| | Coad | Pucinski |
| | Coffin | Quie |
| | Cohelan | Quigley |
| | Collier | Rabaut |
| | Colmer | Rains |
| | Jonas | Randall |
| | Jones, Ala. | Ray |
| | Judd | Rees, Kans. |
| | Karsten | Reuss |
| | Karth | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| | Kastenmeier | Rhodes, Pa. |
| | Kee | Riehlman |
| | Keith | Riley |
| | Kelly | Rivers, Alaska |
| | Keogh | Rivers, S.C. |
| | Kilburn | Roberts |
| | Kilday | Robison |
| | Kilgore | Rodino |
| | King, Calif. | Rogers, Colo. |
| | King, Utah | Rogers, Fla. |
| | Kirwan | Rogers, Mass. |
| | Kluchynski | Rogers, Tex. |
| | Knox | Rooney |
| | Kowalski | Roosevelt |
| | Lafore | Rostenkowski |
| | Diggs | Roush |
| | Dingell | Rutherford |
| | Dixon | St. George |
| | Dollinger | Santangelo |
| | Donohue | Saund |
| | Dooley | Saylor |
| | Dorn, N.Y. | |
| | Dorn, S.C. | |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------|
| Schenck | Taber | Walter |
| Scherer | Teague, Calif. | Wampler |
| Schwengel | Teller | Weaver |
| Scott | Thomas | Weis |
| Selden | Thompson, La. | Wharton |
| Shelley | Thompson, N.J. | Whitener |
| Shipley | Thompson, Tex. | Whitten |
| Short | Thomson, Wyo. | Wier |
| Sikes | Thornberry | Williams |
| Simpson, Ill. | Toll | Willis |
| Sisk | Tollefson | Willson |
| Slack | Trimble | Winstead |
| Smith, Iowa | Tuck | Wolf |
| Smith, Miss. | Udall | Wright |
| Smith, Va. | Ullman | Yates |
| Springer | Vanik | Young |
| Staggers | Van Pelt | Younger |
| Steed | Van Zandt | Zablocki |
| Stratton | Vinson | Zelenko |
| Stubblefield | Wainwright | |
| Sullivan | Wallhauser | |

NAYS—7

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|----------|
| Alger | Simpson, Pa. | Utt |
| Curtis, Mo. | Smith, Calif. | Westland |
| Kasam | | |

NOT VOTING—44

| | | |
|----------|----------------|--------------|
| Anfuso | Hall | Morgan |
| Betts | Hiestand | O'Konski |
| Boggs | Hoffman, Mich. | Perkins |
| Bonner | Holland | Pillion |
| Boykin | Jackson | Reece, Tenn. |
| Buckley | Johnson, Md. | Sheppard |
| Canfield | Jones, Mo. | Siler |
| Carnahan | Kearns | Smith, Kans. |
| Casey | Leard | Spence |
| Downing | Landrum | Taylor |
| Durham | Mason | Teague, Tex. |
| Fogarty | Marrow | Watts |
| Garmatz | Michel | Widnall |
| Glenn | Minshall | Withrow |
| Gray | Moeller | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Betts.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Withrow.
 Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Siler.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Pillion.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Hall with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Moeller with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Glenn.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Kearns.
 Mr. Downing with Mr. Hoffman.
 Mr. Durham with Mr. Marrow.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Perkins with Mr. Minshall.
 Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Jackson.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Hiestand.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 3:30 p.m. today.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 3:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

AMENDING REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 276) providing for the consideration of H.R. 5140, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5140) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Anfuso | Evins | Moeller |
| Ashley | Fogarty | Morgan |
| Barden | Freilighuysen | O'Konski |
| Barry | Garmatz | Perkins |
| Bass, Tenn. | Glenn | Pillion |
| Belcher | Gray | Poage |
| Betts | Gubser | Powell |
| Boggs | Hall | Reece, Tenn. |
| Bonner | Hiestand | Roberts |
| Bowles | Holland | Robison |
| Boykin | Johnson, Md. | Schwengel |
| Burke, Ky. | Jones, Mo. | Siler |
| Burleson | Kearns | Smith, Kans. |
| Cahill | King, Calif. | Smith, Miss. |
| Casey | Kluczynski | Spence |
| Celler | Laird | Taylor |
| Coad | Landrum | Thomas |
| Davis, Tenn. | Lindsay | Watts |
| Dent | Magnuson | Willis |
| Dooley | Mason | Withrow |
| Downing | May | Zelenko |
| Doyle | Metcalf | |

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]; and pending that, I yield

2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, immediately following a vote this morning in which \$2 million was appropriated—which should not have been appropriated—a Member of the House, who had been prominent in the spirited campaign waged to spend the money, came to me and said he made the fight for the amendment because I had told him I was for the amendment and had not kept my word and supported it.

When the State delegation called on me, I said affectionately to the leader of the delegation when he came in, "Of course, you know I cannot deny you anything." But when the appropriation was discussed I made no commitment.

Of course I cannot make promises on such occasions except to say that requests will receive every consideration.

That I made no commitment of any kind is conclusively proven by the statement of another member of the delegation who was present with him and who later testified before the committee as follows:

We have seen Chairman CANNON * * * and of course he treated us very nicely. * * * I still do not know whether he is for it or against it.

You will find his entire testimony on page 420 of the hearings on the bill held Friday, April 17, 1959.

I do not want anybody to think I have promised to do a thing and then have not done it.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 276 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 5140, which would further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour's debate.

H.R. 5140 seeks to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act. It extends the time to June 1, 1961, during which reorganization plans transmitted by the President to the Congress, may take effect. Under existing legislation the time period expires on June 1, 1959.

The Committee on Government Operations which reported out this measure believes that valid reasons exist for currently extending the period of the President's authority in this respect. Although very few reorganization plans under the act have been proposed by the President in recent years, the act has, when utilized, proved to be a useful tool in effecting reorganizations in the executive departments and agencies. At the same time the committee notes that the Reorganization Act of 1949 and earlier similar legislation provided an unusual legislative procedure. Reorganization proposals made by the President must be specifically disapproved by either House of Congress within a given time period—60 days—or they automatically go into effect. Another provision peculiar to this act is that Congress is given no opportunity to amend

such proposals during their consideration. Subsequent amending legislation can be effectively thwarted by a Presidential veto requiring a two-thirds vote to override.

It is because the act has such features that the committee believes each Congress should have a new opportunity to consider the desirability of this type of legislation. This opportunity is afforded by the 2-year extensions which have been enacted by Congress in recent amendments to the law. The committee believes that a permanent extension, as proposed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, would be unwise, and the committee, therefore, recommends that the bill be amended to provide only a 2-year extension.

I urge the adoption of this resolution. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] has explained, House Resolution 276 makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 5140, which would extend for 2 years, from June 1, 1959, to June 1, 1961, the provisions of the 1949 Reorganization Act.

This resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. I know of no objection to the rule. I have no requests for time. Therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5140) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 5140, with Mr. JARMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the matter before us for consideration today is the bill, H.R. 5140, a simple and short piece of legislation which further amends the reorganization act of 1949 to extend the life and operation of the act until June 1, 1961. You are, of course, thoroughly familiar with the purposes of the reorganization act. It authorizes a procedure for improving the structure and management of the executive branch. Under that procedure, the President submits a reorganization proposal in which he outlines and delineates whatever he determines is necessary for reorganization in the executive branch. He submits that to the Congress and the plan

under the law takes effect in 60 days unless, during that period of time, a resolution of disapproval is acted upon by the Congress. Under the present provisions of the law, this authority of the President would expire on June 1, 1959. Under the proposal, which is before the Committee today, the limitation and the authority would be extended under the act until June 1, 1961.

As the proposal was originally submitted by the administration to the Congress, there would have been no time limitation in the act, that is, the authority of the President to submit a reorganization plan pursuant to the provisions of the act would have been extended for an indefinite period of time. When the matter was considered by the full committee and all the various facets and factors of the proposition were discussed, it was determined that the limitation of 2 years should be placed in the law, as was done in similar legislation in the other body. The action in the full committee was not unanimous. The committee report contains three additional separate views. This legislation has been objected to by many since it was first originated, on various grounds. The question of need arises for the extension of the act. There are some who object to the present extension of the act and, in fact, objected in the first instance on the ground that there is really no need for this type of legislation. They maintain that specific legislation can be introduced in the Congress and acted upon affirmatively by the Congress, and in that fashion, therefore, and pursuant to such procedure, there is really no need for the original act and actually no necessity for its extension at this time. However, from a practical standpoint, we have found that it is very, very difficult to get complicated reorganization plans of the executive branch acted upon in the Congress by the consideration of specific, affirmative legislation. Therefore, this reorganization procedure was adopted and has been in effect for many, many years. We come to the simple proposition then as to whether or not the same procedure ought to be extended for an additional 2 years. Under the original act, we find that in 1949 there were eight reorganization plans submitted.

In 1950 there were 27 reorganization plans submitted; 1951, 1; 1952, 5; 1953, 10; 1954, 2; 1956, 2; 1957, 1; 1958, 1; 1959, 1 plan now pending.

Mr. Chairman, I think this speaks for itself on the question of need. Obviously under the act since it requires an examination and a reexamination by the Chief Executive of this country on questions of reorganization, I think the question of need is simple; that is, since it requires continuous examination and since, obviously, this is a process which must go on all the time and since you reach no definitive line today or yesterday or tomorrow, the question of extending it for an additional 2 years is purely and simply based upon the request by the administration that in its judgment it deems such an extension is wise and is warranted at this time. And the majority

of the committee which considered the matter agrees.

There are those who would object to this proposition on the ground that it raises very serious constitutional questions. I have no desire to get into a discussion of constitutional law. Suffice it to say that these issues have been discussed and discussed many times, dating right back to the very time the original act was proposed and every time extensions have been before this body. I would simply say that the question of constitutionality comes up every time the Congress considers this issue. If anyone is seriously concerned about the constitutional question—if the Chief Executive, for example, should question it in 1961—in a new session of the Congress, a new proposal can then be submitted the new Congress to come in with an extension at that time. If the President submits a plan and the Congress does not like it, the Congress can block it by a simple disapproval resolution and the constitutional question can be raised at that time. If the new Congress deems it to be unconstitutional then because the extension was granted by a previous Congress, it can by a simple majority enact a disapproval resolution.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I am sure the gentleman was not in the House in the 81st and 82d Congresses.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct; I was not.

Mr. WIER. So I will not press the gentleman too hard on his personal knowledge of what might have happened in the 81st or 82d Congresses.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. But during the 81st and 82d Congresses we were advised that millions and even billions of dollars could be saved under the reorganization plans to be developed and presented to the Congress. I think in the 81st, 82d, and 83d Congresses we passed some 20 reorganization plans. I submit this because it came from very, very good sources, but I do not think they proved their point.

My question, Mr. Chairman, is: Are there any definite figures to show what was saved under all of these reorganization plans? Certainly the picture is no better today in any of the agencies affected, from the Department of Defense down. So I am just hesitant to believe all of this talk about the millions and billions of dollars to be saved under reorganization plans.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Now, to continue with the legislation which is before the committee, I would say that since this is a simple question of a 2-year extension of the act, an act which has been in existence since 1949, and similar acts even prior to that time, I believe it has been shown to be a useful management tool on the part of the administration. It has been specifically requested by this administration, which called for an extension which was for an indefinite period of time. The com-

mittee recommends that only a 2-year extension was justified so as to let it be reviewed by a new Congress or a new President. We should extend it, and I submit, therefore, that the present legislation should be approved by this committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is as needless a piece of legislation as has come to the House in a long, long time. Everyone knows that under the Constitution the legislative power is given to the Congress.

What does this bill do? Extend for 2 years the attempt to delegate legislative power to a President.

Those who approve it have constantly on every occasion lessened the veto requirements. Under this the President proposes legislation and the House and the Senate have a chance to veto, one or the other—the constitutional process has been reversed. Instead of legislation originating here and giving the President the veto, the procedure has been reversed. Why? There is no valid reason. The President can send down a bill instead of a plan and after committee hearing we would consider it just the same. But we have to monkey with the Constitution every time we get a chance.

There has been complaint about the Supreme Court interfering with the right of the Congress to legislate. What are we doing here? We are extending for 2 years the right of the President to interfere with the legislative authority of the Congress.

I do not know why we should voluntarily shirk our responsibility to pass legislation and send it down to the President, simply reserving for ourselves the power of veto.

I want no part of unconstitutional power and never have had. I have written a minority report, or adverse views, every time the issue has been up. I notice some of those who are warmly supporting it here now were openly against it. I happen to know a half dozen Members who have no faith in it and do not think it is constitutional. But they do not say anything against it and will probably vote for it.

My convictions have been voiced more than once. Read them, then tell me my error if I am in error.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

H.R. 5140, as reported, is just another effort of the Congress to, for an additional 2 years, share with the President its constitutional responsibility and authority to write legislation.

The first 15 words of the Constitution expressly provided that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."¹

It would be difficult for either the Supreme Court of the United States or the Congress to misinterpret that language or give it other than its obvious meaning.

To make certain its intent, the framers of the Constitution by subsequent provisions, after giving the President opportunity to express his disapproval of a legislative proposal, made clear its intent that "all legislative powers" were vested in the Congress; de-

clared that, notwithstanding the express disapproval of a President by a veto, the will of the Congress became law if two-thirds of each House so indicated.²

As a form of government, the Constitution has demonstrated its soundness.

However, individuals, sincere in their convictions that they could improve upon what they consider as an outmoded document, in 1949 prevailed upon the Congress to adopt the Reorganization Act of 1949.

That they did not have full faith in their wisdom is shown by the fact that the authority so given by the act to the President was limited to the period ending April 1, 1953.³

Subsequent Congresses have, on three occasions, when the act has been extended, refused to make it permanent; have indicated their lack of confidence by always fixing a date beyond which it should not be effective.⁴

The act reverses the constitutional legislative process, under which the Congress, subject to a conditional veto, enacts legislation. Under the Reorganization Act, the President, subject to a veto by the Congress, writes legislation.

The Court has declared, and the people have accepted, the decision that Congress cannot delegate its legislative authority,⁵ and it might be added that, in a concurring opinion in another case, Justice Black said that "And, of course, the Constitution does not confer lawmaking power on the President."⁶

Nevertheless, the Congress persists in the attempt.

This contrast in procedures was developed at length by the writer in accompanying views incorporated in a report of this committee on January 30, 1953, on H.R. 1979 (H. Rept. No. 6, 83d Cong., 1st sess.) to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949.

A similar position has also been stated on the floor of the House and in additional views on House Resolution 534 (H. Rept. 2585), 84th Cong., 2d sess., filed July 3, 1956; on H.R. 541 (H. Rept. 2599), 84th Cong., 2d sess., filed July 3, 1956; and on H.R. 8364 (H. Rept. 657), 85th Cong., 1st sess., filed June 27, 1957.

If we lack faith in our own wisdom, sincerity, or patriotism, as the Reorganization Act seems to indicate, why a Congress?

If a sharing of legislative authority is necessary or advisable and legal, why a piecemeal approach—why not permanent legislation?

A subsequent Congress can always repeal an act, notwithstanding a President might desire otherwise, provided, of course, a two-thirds majority so desires.

If a change is desired in legislative procedure, why not proceed in an orderly way by a constitutional amendment? Lawmakers should be law observers.

The bill should be rejected.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the statements made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I might point out that rarely do I concur in his views. But the fact that two of us with such strongly divergent views appear in agreement should be a most persuasive argument as to the rightness of our position.

I point out that we are here being asked to delegate our most solemn responsibility. That is the power to legis-

late, and it has been delegated by this Congress for too long a period of time.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted in the past for this delegation. In looking over the results of that delegation I find, first, that the Congress has in recent years acted on more occasions than the Executive to effect complex reorganizations of our Government. That should disprove very conclusively the contention of those who say that the Congress is incapable of dealing with problems of complex reorganization. In the last Congress we acted on the very complex question of reorganizing the Department of Defense, and we dealt with it. We did not shirk our responsibility. We reorganized the Federal Aviation Agency. We did not shirk our responsibility.

This legislation is not only unwise, it is unnecessary, because the Congress has demonstrated its competence to deal courageously with the problems of complex reorganization.

Mr. Chairman, one of the byproducts of this use of reorganization authority is the fact that we have centered in the hands of secretaries of departments and the heads of agencies a continuing authority to reorganize our Government without submitting anything to the Congress. We have department heads who can make routinely major changes in the functions of their department personnel, in the assignment of duties. They are not called upon to render any accounting to the Congress as to whether or not the reorganization was wise and would effect economies and efficiency.

I think the whole attitude of the Executive is summed up in the plan we had submitted to us last week, in which it was stated that "After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended."

Under the act the Executive is supposed to tell us where we can expect economies or increased efficiency in our Government. We are supposed to have something before us which persuades as to the wisdom of the plan proposed. But, now, there is no longer the feeling that this is necessary. The Congress is going to accept this because the problem of legislating in this area is a difficult one, difficult when it comes by way of a reorganization plan.

Now, what has happened? The plan reaches the Congress, and we must act within 60 days to disapprove, or it becomes law. And, the Executive has in recent years submitted plans later and later in the session, so that they reach the committees at a time when the committee load is already very heavy and it is difficult to get the time of the members or the attention of the members properly to consider the proposed reorganizations. And, the committee interest has been a perfunctory interest. It has not been the responsible discharge of our constitutional responsibilities.

I am not going to tell you that if we pass this, we will have done any irreparable damage to our Government, but

¹ The Constitution, art. I, sec. 1.

² The Constitution, art. I, sec. 7.

³ Public Law 109, 81st Cong., sec. 5(b).

⁴ Public Law 3, 83d Cong.; Public Law 16, 84th Cong.; Public Law 85-286, 85th Cong.

⁵ *Schechter Poultry Corp. v. U.S.*, 295 U.S. 495; *Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan*, 293 U.S. 388; *Yakus v. U.S.*, 321 U.S. 414.

⁶ *Peters v. Hobby*, 349 U.S. 331.

I point out that I think it is time that we examine very closely some of the principles upon which we legislate. I do not relish the role of coming down here and appearing in a position opposite to that of the majority of the committee, or of my very dear friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts. But, I am concerned with the argument today—and I have yet to hear anyone supporting this legislation who does so with any great fervor or feeling that he is supporting a great principle of government. No, we are told we should not take it away from this administration because it would appear to reflect a lack of confidence. Well, let me point that I originally voted for the extension of the authority on the ground that the previous Executive had had it and it would not be proper for us to deny the present occupant of the White House the use of this authority. I voted for an extension on the same basis. Further, I point out that in 1961, regardless of the political makeup of the administration, a new Executive will be in the White House, and if the argument is valid at the beginning of his administration, it will be equally valid that we should not deny him the authority to continue using this legislative power.

I think now, after this Executive has had the authority for 6 years, is a good time to terminate it. There has been no showing of any great need. I emphasize that the Congress has amply demonstrated its ability to deal with the complex questions of reorganization. To abandon this act at this point is consistent with every sound constitutional doctrine, and I suggest to you that we will be rendering a far greater service to permit this act to die. It has served a purpose. There is need for it no longer.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose enactment of H.R. 5140 to extend the Reorganization Plan of 1949.

The bill as originally introduced, would have made the Reorganization Act permanent. As amended by the committee, the act is merely extended for an additional 2 years.

The Reorganization Act is a delegation of legislative power to the Executive and should never be made permanent. Congress would, for all practical purposes, be unable to recall this legislative authority. Any President, regardless of party, would naturally be jealous of his powers and prerogatives and refuse to sign into law any bill passed by Congress recapturing such legislative authority. Only by mustering a two-thirds vote of both Houses to override a veto, could Congress be certain of recalling this permanent grant of legislative powers.

I voted for extensions of the Reorganization Act in 1953 and in 1955 because I believed it was needed by the executive branch of the Government to carry out reorganizational reforms recommended by the first and second Hoover Commissions. But 4½ years have passed, however, since the report of the second Hoover Commission, and ample time has

elapsed for the presentation by the executive branch of any reorganizational reforms resulting from studies and recommendations of the second Hoover Commission.

In the 2d session of the 84th Congress only two reorganizational plans were presented. Both were defeated unanimously and without debate by the House Government Operations Committee and the House itself.

In the 85th Congress only two reorganization plans were submitted. They were of a minor character and easily could have been handled through the regular legislative process. Until Tuesday, May 12, 1959, no reorganization plans were presented to the 86th Congress. On that day the President transmitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, House Document 140, to transfer certain functions related to land or timber exchanges and sales involving Federal lands from the Secretary of Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture. The subject matter of that reorganization plan likewise could be handled through the regular legislative process.

Article I of the Constitution vests the legislative power of the United States in the Congress and there is no question that the Reorganization Act delegates some of that legislative power to the President by authorizing him to propose so-called reorganization plans with a limited right of veto in the Congress. This is legislation in reverse.

Reorganization within the executive branch of the Government which does not contravene existing law can be accomplished by the Executive without resorting to the authority contained in the Reorganization Act. It is only because existing law is necessarily modified or repealed by a reorganization plan that the power granted the Executive in the Reorganization Act is required.

Since the Reorganization Act is in conflict with the legislative process contemplated by the Constitution, Congress must guard its prerogatives jealously, withholding any extension of this legislative power except upon strong showing of unusual need. The burden of proof lies with those who assert the need.

No possible harm can come from permitting the Reorganization Act to expire. When circumstances justify it, the President can ask Congress for a revival of such authority. The legislative history of the Reorganization Act shows that Congress has cooperated in the past, and there is no reason to suppose that it will not be equally as cooperative in the future.

No hearings were held by the Committee on Government Operations either on the request for permanent reorganization authority or on the committee amendment extending authority for a 2-year period. No showing at all has been made. It disturbs me that Congress is so indifferent to its duties and responsibilities under the Constitution that it is willing to continue vesting its policymaking authority in the Executive on so flimsy a record.

Mr. Chairman, what disturbs me most about this bill coming before us is the casual fashion in which we continue to

delegate our legislative authority to the executive branch of the Government.

How does this bill come before us? Was there any enthusiasm on the part of any members of this committee for this measure? No. It originated in a letter from the Bureau of the Budget on February 25 of this year asking, not that the act be extended for 2 years, but that this act be extended in perpetuity. Did the committee hold hearings? Did we ask the executive to sustain the burden of proof of the need for continuance of this extraordinary authority? This bill comes before you without any hearings at all.

Now, 2 years ago, when a similar extension was before us, the request, mind you, was not then to have this authority in perpetuity; only an extension of 2 years. And, that is what we have been doing ever since the act was enacted in 1949; every 2 years it has come before us, and we did have hearings.

On May 28, 1957, when the current act was renewed for 2 years, we had admittedly only brief hearings. And, I must say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], a very able member of our committee, interrogated the witnesses from the executive branch of the Government most skillfully, and the record thus made showed no need for the continuation of the act at that time. That was brought out very clearly. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked the witnesses what reorganization plans they had in mind, and he asked them what use they expected to make of the extraordinary authority that they said they needed. And no case was made. Now the committee asks us, without any hearings whatever and simply because the Bureau of the Budget wants to extend the act in perpetuity, to extend it for 2 years and we are acting hastily without adequate thought or consideration.

What do we think of our oath of responsibility to the people of the United States when our constitutional legislative authority is left in the hands of the executive on no showing of need at all?

I want to point out a few unique features of this very extraordinary method of passing laws which every Member of this House, and particularly the chairman of each committee of this House, ought to know and to consider.

First of all, what happens to a reorganization plan when it is sent up here? It is referred to the Committee on Government Operations. In a sense, when I ask that this act be discontinued and this authority no longer remain with the President, I am taking away jurisdiction from our Committee on Government Operations. But whether that be so or not, I believe it is in the interest of orderly legislation to do so.

First of all, a reorganization plan is referred, not to the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, or some other legislative committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the reorganization plan, but to the Committee on Government Operations.

Second, unless some individual Member introduces a resolution of disapproval, and we go through the rather rigid procedures provided by the act for con-

sidering a reorganization plan—in other words, unless affirmative action is taken by Congress, the plan becomes law in 60 days.

Third, there is no way in the world to amend a reorganization plan. You may like half of it. You may like 75 percent of it. But you cannot change it. It may have a typographical error in it; you cannot even take it out. A reorganization plan must be accepted or rejected in exactly the words in which it is presented.

And finally, once a reorganization plan becomes law, it is actually stronger than the laws which originate in Congress, because it is the proposal of the executive branch of the Government. Originating there, what President is likely to sign a bill repealing a plan originally submitted by himself?

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the committee's attention to something that occurred within the last 2 weeks. We had before us a bill to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, which would have stripped from the Secretary of Agriculture his supervisory authority over REA loans. Members on my right were anxious to have that bill passed. The President vetoed this bill, which would have changed his reorganization plan. The veto was overridden in the other body, but failed to be overridden in the House by a few votes. A four-vote switch would have provided the necessary two-thirds vote to override the veto.

That is a good illustration of the strength of reorganization plans.

Under legislation by reorganization plan, Congress is provided only a limited and ineffective way to understand and study and work its will on the subject matter.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to take our duties and our responsibilities more seriously than to continue to vest in the executive branch of the Government the policymaking authority the Constitution places in us on such a flimsy showing as we have here.

I believe every Member of this House ought to consider this bill very carefully. Mind you, we can always create this extraordinary power in the Executive when a showing is made. And I voted for it when the Hoover Commission recommendations were before us in 1951 and 1953, and again in 1955. I voted to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that reforms emanating from the studies of the Hoover Commission could go into effect rapidly.

Only one plan has been submitted this year. It involves the Interior Department and the Agriculture Department. In my judgment, the Committees on Interior and on Agriculture are far better equipped to study the desirability of plan 1 of 1959 than is the Committee on Government Operations. We have enough jurisdictional conflicts in the House of Representatives without continuing this act which automatically intensifies jurisdictional problems between committees.

We, on the Government Operations Committee, have been criticized by other committees simply because the very charter of our existence has a built-in conflict of investigative authority with

every legislative committee of the House. I think, if we get this reorganization plan authority out of the Committee on Government Operations, it would be a good thing for every one concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman criticized the frivolous manner in which we have regarded this legislation or considered this legislation today. I was a principal offender and I want to apologize to the members of the committee and give you the reason why, perhaps, I did not treat it as seriously as I should have. In my mind, and in my judgment, there is no question at all but that the proposed legislation is unconstitutional. I have consistently opposed it on that ground. And the light manner with which it was treated earlier today by me was due to the way in which it has been considered by the committee. How a Congress composed of as intelligent and patriotic people as I know the Congresses which have preceded have been could from the beginning right down to the present time, go along with this legislation, I cannot understand. It did seem silly to me and it does now—when there is no necessity to ignore constitutional requirements. It seems absurd to pass legislation without complying with constitutional provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill. I realize it takes some temerity for a new Member to rise to speak in support of this bill after the substantial and weighty opposition that we have previously heard. But, it is said that sometimes Jupiter nods and, perhaps, that has been the case with the gentlemen who have previously spoken in opposition to this bill. Simply, the purposes of this legislation are to permit better execution of the laws; to reduce expenditures and promote economy and to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government. Certainly, it seems these objectives are beyond criticism. I submit that the main question here is as to the time of extension of this legislation. There are certain points I think should be mentioned. The objectives, as has already been stated, are good. This is an act that will only cover a period of 2 years. It is not something that is irrevocable. Under certain circumstances, this grant of authority can be taken back if it should be desirable to do so.

It is all very well to say the Congress can do these things, but as a practical matter it is much more difficult for the congressional body to do these things than for the executive body which is the branch which is concerned with the day-to-day operations of the Government. It may be said that they have not done some of these things and, perhaps, that is true. Nevertheless, the objectives being what they are, to increase efficiency and promote economy, it does

seem to me that the executive branch should be permitted to have another chance and we should extend this law for another 2 years to give them the opportunity to take further steps as they did at the beginning when this legislation was first enacted to increase the efficiency of the executive branch of the Government. I do not think there is any danger, as the gentleman from California said, that the passage of this legislation will imperil the country. I think that the opportunity which exists here to do some lasting good by extending this legislation justifies us in continuing it for this brief period of time. I hope that the committee will act favorably upon this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], a former member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, when I was a member of the Committee on Government Operations, and the first bill to extend the Reorganization Act came before our committee a decade or so ago, I opposed it for the same reasons that have been presented to you here today, plus an additional reason. At that time if the President under the law as it existed then sent down a reorganization plan it went into effect after 60 days unless both Houses of the Congress passed a concurrent resolution disapproving the plan. That allowed the President and one branch of the Congress to legislate. It seemed to me that certainly was contrary to our Constitution.

If a bill goes through one House of the Congress but is not passed by the other body it never gets any further. It seemed to me that if either body of this Congress passed a resolution disapproving a plan that ought to kill it. The President could take the plan back and correct whatever we had disapproved in it and send it back to us revised for another go. We lost out at first in our efforts to change the legislation from the original form requiring disapproval by both Houses. We had that kind of law for almost 20 years, as I recall. The Nation did not fall even when the President and one House could legislate in this field of reorganizing the departments and agencies of the executive branch.

I think it was 7 or 8 years ago that we got the basic Reorganization Act amended so that now a resolution by one House disapproving a reorganization plan kills it. The Executive has to cut out or change the items disapproved by that House if he wants to get the plan adopted.

What I am saying is that when the President and one House could legislate, even if the other House disapproved, that I thought was wrong. But even with that, nothing dire or disastrous happened to our country. And that pattern has now been corrected. It has been changed so that either House of Congress can prevent a reorganization plan from going into effect if it wishes. The trend has not been to more power in the executive branch, but to less.

It has been said here that the committee did not give much attention to

this particular resolution extending the Reorganization Act. Well, if it did not study carefully something that is allegedly as dangerous as this is purported to be, then do you think that the committee or the House itself would go into all the details involved in a proposed reorganization of an executive department that is designed to enable it to do its work more efficiently and economically?

The Congress can, of course, carry out these reorganizations, it has the authority. But as a matter of fact it almost never did in the first 150 years of the history of this Republic. Only after the first Reorganization Act was passed, about the early thirties, I believe, was there real progress in this field. The executive agencies are so big now that as a practical matter we in the Congress are not likely to do well so complicated a task as the reorganization of an executive department or agency. This reorganization method has proved in experience to be more effective and is adequately safeguarded. So I trust the resolution extending it for 2 years will be adopted.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a year or two ago, the Governor of Colorado for whom I worked asked me to do some research on this same proposition, and as a matter of fact as a member of the State legislature I had made a similar study looking toward the possibility of giving this Governor, Edwin C. Johnson, this power in our own State. This power was first given to Herbert Hoover as President, and has been given to every President since.

The Constitution states that the executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States or in the Governors of the States. The law which we are extending, and you will find this on pages 5 and 6 of the report, makes it crystal clear that no reorganization plan can extend any function beyond the time it otherwise would die, that it cannot authorize any agency to exercise any function not expressly authorized by law, nor can it increase the term of office beyond that provided by law for such office. Under this we are not giving the President the power to legislate. If we did it would be unconstitutional. What we are giving the Chief Executive is the power to make an orderly discharge of the functions of his office. There are many agencies of Government carrying on related or sometimes duplicating and overlapping activities. From personal experience I know the confusion that arises from working on projects where different departments of the State or Federal Government had these overlapping or duplicating powers. The use of a similar power to this in that instance resulted very successfully in the orderly operation of government.

The Congress is given the power to disapprove of any reorganization plan submitted. This is a power not too often used, but necessary at times to the President in the orderly discharge of the functions of his office.

It seems to me perfectly proper to make it possible for the Chief Executive more effectively to discharge the duties of his office and incidentally save us from trying to duplicate the full responsibilities which go with the job of Chief Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say just very briefly that I support this legislation. I have been supporting legislation similar to this for a long time.

Before the gentleman from Ohio undertakes to talk to us I would just like to commend him for his very active interest in this whole matter, not only in the legislative field, but as one of the members of the Hoover Commission whose very fine efforts have brought beneficial results as a result of reorganization acts already submitted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much for his comment.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent a great many years of my life studying the organization and reorganization of government. As many of you know, I was the author of the legislation which created the first and second Hoover Commissions and served on both Commissions. The first Commission gave a great deal of thought and study to this question of reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and made certain recommendations which the Congress saw fit to enact into law.

I have served as a member of the Government Operations Committee of this House, along with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, for quite a number of years, and have served on the subcommittee which has handled reorganization matters. I feel that there is a great deal of ado about nothing in connection with this particular piece of legislation which is before us at the present time, and I hope that in the few minutes I have I may be able to clarify the situation and perhaps be of some assistance or help to you in your thinking as to whether or not this bill should be approved.

Mr. Chairman, all that this piece of legislation does is to change just three words in the Reorganization Act of 1949. It strikes out the words "June 1, 1959" and inserts in lieu thereof the words "June 1, 1961" which, of course, would have the force and effect of continuing for 2 years the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

There has been a great deal of argument and a great deal of talk here on the floor by those who oppose the continuation of this legislation, saying that it interferes in some way with our right to legislate. Someone said it interferes in some way with the right of the Congress to legislate. But it does not interfere whatsoever in anyway with the right of the Congress to legislate on any matter affecting the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government or any of its agencies and departments. In-

stead, the right to so legislate still rests in the Congress, and any Member of this body or of the other body can present any legislation that he or she may desire, making any changes in the organization structure of the Government at any time, and that legislation will be given the same consideration that all other bills are given by the legislative committees of this House.

There has been raised the question of constitutionality. Why, we have been operating under this type of legislation for 27 long years and never in that time has anybody questioned in court, to my knowledge, the constitutionality of this or of previous laws of this nature. Certainly, if there was any grave constitutional question involved with all of the different reorganization plans that have been submitted and adopted, some smart lawyer, some smart attorney, would have taken the matter into the courts of the United States, if he believed it unconstitutional, and had the Federal court and perhaps the Supreme Court declare such legislation to be unconstitutional.

Let me trace back for a moment the history of this legislation. It first appeared in the Economy Act of 1932, which was introduced in the last Congress in the Hoover administration. Mr. Hoover supported the legislation because it was for the purpose of getting greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the Federal business.

You will recall that the great depression of 1929 had descended on the country, and that is the reason why that Economy Act was passed and that authority to reorganize was given to the President at that time. Then in 1933, Mr. Roosevelt became President of the United States, and the Economy Act of 1933, which went even further, was enacted into law, both times I may say to those of you on the majority side, by the votes of the Democratic-controlled Congress: Once when a Republican President suggested it and once when a Democratic President suggested it.

Then we went along quite awhile under the Economy Act of 1933, and in 1939, as the gentleman from Massachusetts will remember, we passed a Reorganization Act under the administration of President Roosevelt which at that time exempted certain agencies and departments of the Government from any reorganization action by the President and provided at that time that it would require a vote of both branches of Congress, to reject a reorganization plan. We argued a lot about that, and a lot of us thought that was not quite right and was not quite fair; that this gave just a little too much advantage to the Chief Executive, and if you were going to reverse this procedure, that a rejection resolution should be adopted by only one House to reject a reorganization plan. Then the Hoover Commission recommended that the Reorganization Act of 1939 be placed back in operation and that it be amended so that it required a constitutional majority vote by only one branch of the Congress. I opposed that at that time. I thought it should be a simple majority, but I favored the entire bill because I thought it was necessary to have

a Reorganization Act. That resolution was passed by a huge majority in the Congress. That was the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It required a constitutional majority of one branch, as I remember it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; that was a constitutional majority, although I favored a simple majority.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I was the one, I think, who helped greatly in putting that in.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if this was such a wonderful thing, why is it that every time the extension comes up you have lessened the requirements to stop it?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, I am just exactly like the gentleman from Michigan. I want a perfect state if I can get it, and I always work for a perfect law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just a moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no; you cannot answer the next one.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, I do not know the question the gentleman is going to ask. The gentleman asks questions sometimes that even the good Lord cannot answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At least, He will listen to my questions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You and the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], will have to fight that out.

Now, let me go further. Then, in 1957 we finally got the law perfected the way many of us believed it should be, and that was a simple majority of either branch. A simple majority of either branch could kill a reorganization plan, which means the absolute reverse of our present system where it takes two branches of the Congress to approve a bill.

Now, that is the present law of today. What does this act provide besides extending it? What is this act that we are extending? What does this act of 1949, as amended, provide? It puts every safeguard in the world around and about these reorganization plans or reorganization plan ideas. First it provides that:

The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

I think every Member of the Congress of the United States wants to see that done. The President must find it necessary and advisable before he submits a plan.

Now let us go just a little further. This 1949 act placed certain limitations on the powers of the President so that he cannot abuse this act, as some indicate he might possibly do. But no President, whether he was Democrat or Republican, in my opinion, has ever abused the power, and every President, both Republican and Democratic, since 1932, has been for this kind of operation.

Here are the limitations on the power of the President:

No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all of the functions thereof;

In other words, where Congress has set up a department, they cannot abolish it.

(2) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made;

That means that the President by reorganization plan cannot continue something Congress has limited, that Congress has said he may not do after a certain date.

(3) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(5) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office; or

(6) transferring to or consolidating with any other agency the municipal government of the District of Columbia or all those functions thereof which are subject to this act, or abolishing said government or all said functions.

And, no provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan has been transmitted to Congress and an opportunity has been given to pass upon it.

All this bill does is to extend for 2 years this act which safeguards every constitutional right of Congress. It should pass. I think it must be approved if we believe in economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public business.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman has made a very fine and comprehensive analysis of the entire operation of the act. In support of what the gentleman says, I would point out the fact that 57 reorganization plans have been submitted by the President since 1949. Some have been disapproved. As a matter of fact, the most recent was in 1956, Reorganization Plan No. 2 which was sent up, and a disapproval resolution was adopted by this Congress. Two plans since then have become effective without any action.

I think that this summary by the gentleman shows the effectiveness of the operation of this matter and the protection which has been put around it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to conclude the debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is nothing new to the House. We have had it before us in one form or another since 1932. I voted for the original bill. I do not know whether I voted for the Economy Act of 1932; I know I voted against the Economy Act of 1933. I remember well voting for the original recommendation made by Franklin D. Roosevelt in connection with the delegation of this power to the President of the United States. And I voted for the extensions of it throughout the years under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman; and I voted for the extension during the last 6 years under Dwight Eisenhower. I see no reason why I should fail to vote for this bill extending it for 2 more years during the remainder of the term of President Eisenhower and the early months of the term of whoever may be the next President of the United States.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and other gentlemen who have preceded him have stated the justification for legislation of this kind with this delegation of power. It does not take away one iota from the Congress of the United States. We have the power to legislate originally or, if a reorganization plan comes up, we may reject that plan or we may act concurrently; that is, we may reject the plan and originate and enact legislation of our own relating to the plan.

The reason for this legislation years ago was the fact that during a period of at least 150 years of our constitutional government there was never one executive reorganization made by the Congress of the United States.

You and I know why. Once the Congress started to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, then the

pressure would be upon us. There would be the pulling and hauling upon Members. The result was that Congress never did get around to passing a bill to reorganize the executive branch of our Government. We recognized the difficulties from a practical angle. Mr. Chairman, as I have said and other Members have said, this legislation in no way takes away one iota of the constitutional jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. As a matter of fact, it complements and implements our power. We retain all of our constitutional power and jurisdiction, but we say in view of the practical situation that exists, we recognize that the Chief Executive from time to time can make reorganizations of the executive branch or parts thereof which would be in the interest of our Government, and not only in the interests of economy but also in the interests of efficiency and better administration. We reserve to ourselves the right to reject it, if we want to, but we do have all the power to initiate legislation dealing with such matters that we have ever had or that any Congress of the United States ever has had since the inception of our constitutional form of Government.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I am sure my leader, just as I did, during the 81st and 82d and 83d Congresses, received thousands of letters from people back home who had great hopes built up that the Hoover Commission reports would result in great accomplishments in economy, efficiency, and in other aspects of government.

Mr. McCORMACK. I received several letters.

Mr. WIER. Can the gentleman put his finger on one time that this Commission has saved? Can he point to any efficiency that has been achieved? On the contrary, I find that government is getting bigger and more expensive.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the fact is that government is getting bigger, but that is due to the times in which we live, it is due to the circumstances and the progress we have made. It is the result of the great responsibilities which rest upon our shoulders. On the question of economy, I am satisfied that many of these plans have brought about economy in our Government and efficiency through the medium of preventing larger appropriations which would have to be made if the reorganization plans did not go through.

To answer the gentleman's question as to direct savings. I cannot point my finger at it, but I have no question that as to indirect savings, there have been considerable savings as a result of the reorganization plans submitted by Roosevelt, submitted by Truman, and submitted by Eisenhower.

Mr. WIER. One more question. How about the redtape that has grown up under these Commission plans? The redtape is getting thicker and denser all the time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to take issue with my dear friend on that.

Redtape will exist anywhere. By redtape, I take it the gentleman refers to bureaucracy. That exists under Democrats, it exists under Republicans, and it will continue to exist, because it results from the entrenchment of certain agencies of the executive branch, and it is our job to try to weed it out. The fact that bureaucracy exists is not to be blamed on the reorganization plans or on the reorganization law. We have to be frank and honest with ourselves. Bureaucracy exists no matter what administration is in control. I think this is a very good bill. I will be frank with the House. I would vote for a permanent law. I reluctantly accepted the 2-year amendment. So now this bill provides for a 2-year extension. Addressing my Democratic friends, I do not see how we can deny to President Eisenhower what we have given to President Roosevelt and to President Truman. I think it would be unwise politics. To my Republican friends, I say I do not see how you can fail—outside of my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and I am sorry to say my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], who seems to be drawn into the gravitational sphere and orbit of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—I do not see how my Republican friends can very well vote against this bill when this is the recommendation of the President of the United States, who is a Republican, and who until his termination of office is presumed, at least ostensibly, and apparently, to be the leader of the Republican Party.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I thought the gentleman was going to mention the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 705), as last amended by the Act of September 4, 1957 (71 Stat. 611; 5 U.S.C. 1332-3(b)), is hereby repealed. The subsection designation "(a)" appearing in the said section 5 is hereby deleted from that section.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such Act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1961."

Committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C. 1332-3), as last amended by the Act of September 4, 1957 (71 Stat. 611), is hereby further amended by striking out 'June 1, 1959' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 1, 1961'."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather interested in the fact that as we go into a reading of the bill for amendment you have heard from those who support this legislation, and I still make the statement that there has been no enthusiasm for this, and most certainly there has not been any demonstrated need.

Now, for the contention that we do not give away anything, that is not precisely the fact: We delegate an authority to legislate, and we impose on our consideration of the legislation which is then submitted by the Executive certain conditions which are not imposed on us when we are legislating upon proposals originating in either House of the Congress.

I do not have to remind you how difficult it is sometimes to get adequate hearings and to complete committee action within a period of 60 days, but that is precisely what we have to do on these executive legislative proposals; we have to hold hearings. If we hold hearings we have to act or disapprove in 60 days, and if we do not disapprove, which means an action concurred in by a majority of this House, it becomes law.

Mr. Chairman, I would love to have my legislation considered under such favorable conditions. It would be much easier for me to get the things which the people of my district want, and I think each of us would benefit.

So we do give away something and we grant a highly preferential right to the Executive as he wields certain constitutional powers.

The gentleman from Colorado said that there has been no substantive legislation achieved. Oh, yes, there has. Let me read this to you. Under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949, what kind of authority do we give away? This is the Post Office Department:

There are hereby transferred to the Postmaster General the functions of all subordinate officers and agencies of the Post Office Department, including the functions of each Assistant Postmaster General, the Purchasing Agent for the Post Office Department, the Comptroller, and the Bureau of Accounts.

This regardless of duties assigned those gentlemen by law. They are now transferred to the Postmaster General. And what may he do with them?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. MEADER. With respect to whether or not this is legislation, referring to the question raised by the gentleman from Colorado, I recall one reorganization plan early in the history of this legislation which placed the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the Department of Commerce, and only last year by legislation we changed it and gave it its independence.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman is correct; and I might point out that functions are assigned to the chairman of an independent commission as a result of the reorganization acts, which were never intended by the Congress, and never approved by a committee. At the present time the House is seriously considering a possible reassignment of those functions back to the commissions.

Now, to continue with the Postmaster General, as to what he may do with all this authority in his hands:

The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to delegate to any officer, employee, or agency of the Post Office Department designated by him such of his functions as he deems appropriate.

And he does not have to come back to you or me; and he has undertaken a tremendous reorganization. I do not know how many more millions of dollars it costs us, but this is a substantive legislative act; and this is an instance where bureaucracy becomes self-perpetuating, because under this a delegation of authority now is firmly held by one man, and the bureaucracy can pressure without the full advice of the Congress. These things are not always on the side of efficiency or economy in government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from California has merely begun to develop a very important subject, because I feel many Members here, from the discussion and the comments that have been made to me, think that this matter of presenting reorganization plans is only a more or less administrative function of the President and is not legislative power.

Let me point out, first, that any economy and efficiency that the President can achieve through reorganization that does not involve changing existing law, that is not in conflict with any statute, he may do without this Reorganization Act power, without presenting any reorganization plan. He just uses his authority. It is only when he wants to change existing law that he sends reorganization plans up here. That act gives him the authority to transfer and combine functions created by law. It has been exercised in that way.

I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] sitting over there. It is perfectly possible for the President to take the Immigration and Naturalization Service out of the Justice Department and put it in the Department of Labor. Would you call that just a minor matter of reorganization for efficiency?

Mr. Chairman, there are far-reaching consequences in this power. It is legislative power, because if it does not affect existing law there would be no need for any Reorganization Act at all.

Let me mention one or two other reorganization plans that have come up. I refer to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, which had to do with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Congress passed a law giving vast lending authority to this institution, and it set up five Directors of the RFC, provided for staggered terms, it provided that not more than one should come from the

same Federal Reserve district and they had to come back for reappointment and confirmation, upon expiration of their terms.

What did Reorganization Plan 1 of 1951 do? It abolished the Board of Directors and vested the entire authority of the RFC in one Administrator who had no limitation on his term. Now that is a far-reaching change in a body created by the Congress with specific limitations. It was accomplished through a reorganization plan by taking the existing law and by removing the checks and safeguards that Congress had carefully set up, thus vesting much greater authority in the executive branch of the Government than was ever intended by the Congress.

That is why it is dangerous to have such power existing in the executive branch unless there is a showing of need for it. The burden of proof is upon those who claim this authority should exist in the Executive, to show some reason for it. There has been no such showing, and Congress ought to preserve its constitutional responsibility, it ought to be jealous of its prerogatives and not lightly and frivolously turn them over to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. What the gentleman is pointing out about the RFC, can that be done under this particular act?

Mr. MEADER. It was done under this act.

Mr. YOUNGER. No. It was done under the Reorganization Act which has been changed, and it cannot be done under this act. I think the gentleman understands that, too.

Mr. MEADER. That is completely wrong. With reference to Reorganization Plan 1 of 1951, to which I referred, an identical plan could be presented under the act we are extending today. There is not any change in the law except the vote by which Congress can disapprove a plan. That is the only change we have made.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true that after this 1951 plan was adopted, which the gentleman is talking about, the reorganization plan, an extension was up before the Congress in 1953 and the Reorganization Act was extended by a vote of 389 to 5? In other words, all of the issues which the gentleman has discussed were brought out and discussed completely and thoroughly at that time.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman confuses the point I am making. We have extended the Reorganization Act at least three times to take advantage of the studies of the Hoover Commission, but the work of that Commission has been done for 3 or 4 years now. They have made no showing that there is need for this extraordinary power at this time, and I think we ought to require a showing before we give away our authority.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I also voted for the reorganization plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words just to answer the arguments that have been made.

I would like to point out that none of these things that have been complained of by the gentlemen who have spoken could be put into effect if the Congress objected by a majority vote of a single body of those present.

No. 2. I think the very fact, as the gentleman from California explained on the floor, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration was put into the Federal Aviation Agency by the Congress of the United States, proves that the Congress can still legislate as it sees fit on reorganization of the executive branch of Government, and has done so.

I think the arguments that have been made fall of their own weight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when this discussion first opened, it was not my purpose to repeat arguments that have been made time and again. But, the situation is such now that some of the Committee members, I think, have overlooked and should be advised of what we are doing.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], are very, very adroit politicians. The gentleman from Ohio was granted control of the time gladly and willingly. And what did he talk about when he got on the floor? Not about this bill, only incidentally. He talked about the Economy Act, and he made a very good case for it. But that is not up for decision today. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] said that he had voted to give this power to President Roosevelt and to President Truman and to President Eisenhower and I assume that he did. But that does not make the grant legal. And when this was up one time and the Republicans happened to have control of the Committee on Government Operations, I have a very distinct recollection that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] advised me when I was chairman of that committee an amendment would be accepted and the legislation would have an end, that is, the question of this power being granted. Then, the next morning, after I polled the Republicans, and every last one of them had agreed to the amendment, I was advised that they had changed their mind downtown from the day before. And, when I asked why, I was told that President Roosevelt and President Truman had had the power and it would be an insult to President Eisenhower if he did not get it. I asked them if they felt that if either one of the former Presidents had had the measles, that we should see to it that President Eisenhower had the measles. Now,

that is the reason given at that time for that extension.

I say it is an absurd reason. The question before the committee right now is not whether it is expedient or whether a dollar can be saved, but whether we are adhering to constitutional procedure, adhering to the Constitution, and insist that legislation that goes through the House complies with the conditions prescribed therein. That is the issue, and we cannot get away from it by claiming money will be saved or that better legislation will be enacted. Everyone knows that the first 15 words in the Constitution are that "all"—you get that "all"—legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States. And, to make certain they gave the President a chance to veto, and then they came right back in a later provision in the Constitution and said that when two-thirds of the Members of each House had a contrary mind, the veto of the President did not count. Now, here we are doing exactly the opposite. Reversing the procedure. The President is by a reorganization plan—when he could give us his views by a bill—sending up proposed legislation, and without a single vote of any Member his proposal becomes the law of the land, unless a majority of one House vetoes it within a stated number of days. If the Constitution is not right, if the method of legislating is not sound, let us submit a constitutional amendment. Why dodge or ignore the express, clear, plain provision of the Constitution itself. Every last one of us has taken an oath to support the Constitution, and yet we come along and reverse the procedure under which proposed legislation becomes law. It is all right with me if you want it that way, that is your privilege, the privilege of every Member of the House, but that is the issue and we cannot get away from it.

Does the oath of office mean nothing?

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, many Members this afternoon have referred to the Reorganization Act in terms of its effect on legislative powers and Executive powers. We have heard it said that Congress must guard its prerogatives jealously. But I say that Congress must not only guard its own prerogatives jealously, but it must zealously protect the prerogatives of the President.

We all live under the same Constitution. We have taken an oath to uphold that Constitution. We have sworn to uphold article II of the Constitution on the Executive power, just as surely as we have sworn to uphold article I of the Constitution on the legislative power and the other articles. Since Congress can be counted on in most circumstances to defend its own power, it becomes incumbent on the Members to exercise perhaps a little extra care in the defense of the Executive power and the judicial power.

When I hear talk about the "arrogance" of the executive branch and the President in this debate, my mind wanders back to the "arrogant" Presidents in American history—Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lin-

coln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. Yes, they were "arrogant" in the eyes of some publicists. All I can say is that I wish we had had more of that kind of arrogance from the White House in the past 6 years.

Therefore, it seems to me that in considering this immediate issue the Congress must recognize that this is no petty question of gaining or losing power by the executive or legislative branch. The core of this issue is which branch is best equipped to make modern democracy more effective, efficient, and economical through reorganization, simplification, and streamlining the bureaucracy. Let us face it. Congress is simply not organized to perform the kind of executive reorganization which modern government demands. If we in Congress insist in tying the apron strings tighter, we are hamstringing ourselves and diverting our energies from more pressing functions.

And so, my friends, do not fall prey to the argument that Congress must take on these reorganization functions. Under the committee bill, we have the power to review and disapprove of these reorganization plans, which is the clean-cut and right way this should be done under the Constitution.

I urge my fellow Members to cast a responsible vote and support the extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949 as reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. JARMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5140) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act, pursuant to House Resolution 276, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a reading of the engrossed copy.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I have the honor of being chairman, has made arrangements to visit the Woods Hole Oceanographic Laboratory in Massachusetts on Monday and Tuesday of next week. We have already gotten out notices of hearings that will be held there. I wanted to give notice of that to the House so that the House will know that members of the subcommittee, if they are absent, are absent on official business.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing attention to this very important phase that I think we have neglected—oceanography. I hope that we shall put much emphasis on it and see that a proper program of research is developed. This is going to be important to our entire Nation.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I thank the gentleman. That is what we are trying to do.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 51 I was paired in favor of the bill and then left to address a very important meeting of Westchester and New York County postmasters at the Readers Digest Auditorium in Westchester County. When I returned to the Congress, I found that I was not paired and upon inquiry, I learned from the pairing clerk that the Member opposed to the bill had returned to the Chamber and had insisted upon voting against the bill in person.

I therefore wish it to be recorded that I was in favor of the principle of the legislation and would have voted for the bill but do not favor certain parts of the bill and hope that they can be ironed out in conference in line with the recommendations of the President's message to the Congress.

WE MUST WIPE OUT THE MENACE OF PLASTIC BAGS TO LITTLE CHILDREN

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that yesterday I introduced a bill, H.R. 7387, to ban the use in interstate commerce of these plastic bags for laundry and drycleaning purposes which have taken such a heavy toll recently of little children.

Mr. Speaker, this apparently harmless little object has suddenly become a deadly household menace in the United States, and the fact that the use of these bags at the present time is on the increase by laundries and drycleaning establishments, so that they are going into the homes of the Nation in increasingly great numbers, presents us with a situation which we must deal with quickly and effectively. I have been advised that in the first 5 months of this year nearly 35 children have lost their lives as a result of playing with these plastic bags. By comparison, some 20 children lost their lives in all of 1958 by the same method. The very day that I introduced my bill a 6-month-old baby suffocated in one of these bags in Alexandria, La., according to the Associated Press. The day before a 3-month-old baby had suffocated in Cleveland, Ohio, according to a report which appeared in the Wall Street Journal. The same day my bill was introduced the U.S. Public Health Service announced plans to begin a nationwide educational program designed to keep these bags out of the hands of children, and the New York State Safety Division announced an emergency alert directed toward parents to regard such bags as deadly poison and keep them out of the reach of children.

I do not believe that any further evidence is needed to convince us of the seriousness of the threat which these bags present to the homes of the little children of America. But it is not enough for us, Mr. Speaker, to compromise with this kind of a menace and merely urge people to keep these bags away from children in the same way that we now urge them to avoid killing themselves in automobiles. These bags certainly serve no necessary public purpose that could not be performed just as well by some other object. And just as long as we permit them to continue to be introduced into the homes of America more of our children are going to continue to lose their lives. It is just that simple.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the drycleaning and laundry industries of America would rise to this occasion and voluntarily agree to ban these bags from one end of the land to the other. But in order to protect the individual who will take such action in the public interest as a result of such an appeal from the action of some who might be disposed to ignore it, I believe we need effective legislation on the books, and we need it promptly. I believe H.R. 7387 is effective and necessary legislation.

My bill would ban these bags in interstate commerce if they are intended for use for drycleaning or laundry purposes and if they have a diameter of 4 inches or more. In order not to impose an unnecessary hardship on the drycleaning industry, my bill would not put this ban into effect until 3 months after the adoption of the legislation. But in the meantime, it would require that all bags shipped in interstate commerce for this purpose be clearly marked, in large red capital letters, "Danger—keep out of reach of children—destroy immediately after use." My bill would also provide appropriate enforcement procedures, similar to those included in the legislation adopted some years ago to ban unsafe refrigerators from interstate commerce, a commodity, by the way, which had also been demonstrated to be highly dangerous to children.

Because of the urgent nature of this emergency, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which this bill has been referred, will hold early hearings on the measure, and that this body, together with the other body, will enact it quickly into law to put an end to this senseless and needless and tragic waste of life.

PENSIONS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report contains a brief item that should be of immediate concern to the 86th Congress. It points out that many widows face the loss of their entire Veterans' Administration pensions because social security benefits were increased at the start of this year. Under law a widow may not collect a VA pension if her income from other sources amounts to more than \$1,400 a year. Social security benefits are included in "other sources." In many cases, according to U.S. News & World Report, the recent increase in social security benefits brings many widows over the \$1,400 limit. As a result, they lose their entire VA pensions. To make matters worse, there is no provision under present social security law which permits a recipient to refuse to accept an increase in benefits. Thus we have the curious spectacle of widows suffering financial losses because they are obliged to accept a few extra social security dollars they wish they didn't have to take.

Now, this is, of course, a technicality which I have no doubt will be corrected by this Congress. Surely we cannot sit idly by while widows, through no fault of their own, are deprived of much-needed pensions.

I bring the matter to the attention of the House for a different reason. This

is not the first time the old people have been victimized by pension technicalities. To cite just one other example: Until a few years ago a widow collecting social security benefits based upon her deceased husband's earnings had to be mighty careful in the event she contemplated remarriage. If she remarried she had, of course, to forfeit her benefits. But unless her new husband survived at least the first year of marriage, she was entitled to nothing based on his earnings record. Not only that, she could not even reapply for her old benefits, based upon her first husband's earnings. Thus, if her new husband died during the first year of marriage, the poor woman was left with absolutely nothing.

Fortunately the Congress corrected this absurdity, and the situation no longer prevails.

However, the two examples I mention point up the unnecessary complexity of our Social Security Act. It is full of complications which time and time again tend to penalize the very people the program is supposed to help. And, as always, it tends to reward the relatively well-to-do with maximum earnings by paying them the highest benefits, and discriminates against the low income people who need the most help in the years of their retirement by paying them the lowest benefits. In a very real sense the present Social Security Act thus favors those who need the least security and penalizes those who need the most. It is folly to describe such a system as social security.

It is my firm conviction that the American people deserve a social security system worthy of the name, and fortunately, such a proposal exists, and has for a long time. I refer to the Townsend Plan for National Insurance, which has been submitted to this Congress by Mr. BLATNIK as H.R. 4000 and by Mr. GUBSER as H.R. 4001.

Such absurdities as the ones I have recounted here could not happen under the Townsend plan. Its purpose is to pay pensions equitably; each eligible recipient would get the same amount, and thus pension discrimination would be a thing of the past. Nor would there be a myriad of obscure restrictions calculated to deny pension protection to certain individuals or groups. The tax burden would be shared equally. There would be no double standard as is now the case under social security, with its one set of taxes for the self-employed and its other for those who work for employers other than themselves.

Ask a hundred people at random, "How much social security will you get when you retire?" I will warrant not more than two or three out of the hundred will have the vaguest notion. This seems to be a deplorable situation. Here is a program which purports to touch intimately almost every man, woman, and child in the Nation, yet almost nobody really knows what it is all about. The result, in many cases, is heartbreak.

Surely this Congress can provide the country with a sound, sensible, fair, equitable, easy-to-understand insurance

system which will do far more than the present social security system, do it better, and do it more economically.

That is why I have advocated the Townsend plan all of my years in Congress, and why I support this legislation today. I earnestly believe it is the proper solution to our social security problem. I commend it to my colleagues.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, warm weather has arrived and the full glory of summer will soon be upon us. The American public is taking to the highways and byways. As the weather gets warmer and eventually hot, the automobile drivers, particularly on weekends, will soon start losing their patience and start displaying their tempers. This is what has always happened in the past and will no doubt occur again this year.

We are approaching the first of our summer holidays—Memorial Day. This day has been set aside as a national holiday to honor our dead. Unfortunately, the statistics of the past indicate that this is the first of a series of weekends where we unnecessarily increase the average number of those who die. And where do these deaths take place? On our highways. The statistics clearly point up the increase in the number of traffic accidents and fatalities which take place with the advent of Memorial Day. I will not take time to cite figures. We are all too familiar with them, and publicizing them fails to stunt their yearly growth.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have long been interested in the problem of traffic safety. I was one of the original sponsors of the resolution which led to the creation of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I served on that subcommittee from its inception in 1956 until the end of 1958. I am still very much interested in the problems of traffic safety.

The efforts of that subcommittee have already produced results. However, there is still more that needs to be done—much more in fact. The deemphasis of speed and horsepower in automobile advertising has been somewhat helpful. The use of safety equipment as standard equipment on all automobiles would also be helpful; but, less than 20 percent of all automobile accidents can be attributed to the car and mechanics. The balance, which is by far a preponderance, is due to the human factor.

Here is where the greatest effort is needed, a concerted effort to educate the public and make them ever aware of highway safety.

This educational program of awareness is the duty and responsibility of each and every person in this great Nation.

Only by each of us practicing highway courtesy and safety can we achieve our objective. Groups of people must be formed for this purpose. More of the existing organizations must lend their assistance. Every effort possible must be made and every means available must be used to reduce the highway toll. After all, the automobile itself is not a fatal or dangerous weapon. And yet, every day people get behind the wheel of a car and lose all sense of responsibility, courtesy, good manners and—at times—reason.

The traffic safety record in my own State of Maryland has not been an enviable one in the past. However, under the able leadership of our present Governor, the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, it is hoped that great improvement will be made. Being aware of the problems and responsibilities of traffic safety, Governor Tawes placed the issue of traffic safety and highway improvement in his platform when running for the office he now holds. The Maryland State Legislature recently passed two measures which were contained in the Governor's platform. One is the point system for revoking the licenses of habitual offenders of traffic laws, and the other is the drunk-o-meter test, used in determining whether or not one is driving while under the influence of alcohol. Both of these measures have proven helpful in other States where enacted, and we are looking for similar results in Maryland.

Among the measures now being considered are an inspection system and a high school driver education program. The inspection of automobiles, though valuable in assuring the safe condition of vehicles, will do nothing toward the problem of improving drivers and their attitudes. A high school driver education program, on the other hand, is most valuable in this field.

Such a program teaches our youngsters the proper and safe way to drive, and points up to them the dangers in excess speed, the dangers of reckless driving, and the dangers of not keeping their minds on their business. The institution of this type of program in some States has helped to decrease the number of accidents involving teenagers and those in their early twenties. It also seems to assist in the leveling or even lowering of automobile insurance rates. Experience has shown that this training remains with the driver the rest of his life and safe driving can lengthen many lives.

Civic groups and public spirited citizens have been working in the field of traffic safety for some time. However, I repeat, more effort is needed.

I should like to mention a few such activities in Maryland. The Mayor's Youth Advisory Council's Third Annual Teen-Age Traffic Safety Conference was held this past March on the campus of Johns Hopkins University. This conference, sponsored by the Baltimore Safety Council and the Sunpapers, was attended by 150 delegates representing every public, private, and parochial school in

Baltimore. They met to give serious study to the problem of traffic safety. They discussed the part teenagers must play and the responsibility they must assume, if there is going to be any improvement in our traffic accident experience.

As a result of the conference, recommendations were made under five general categories: First, driver licensing; second, family car—joint responsibility; third, legislation affecting youth; fourth, traffic safety action programs for teenagers; and fifth, practical law enforcement. In conjunction with the teenage conference an adult session was held, attended by faculty safety advisers of 15 high schools and representatives from several safety organizations. The purpose of this session was to suggest specific traffic safety projects to interested teenage drivers and a total of seven such projects were suggested.

These young people and the others who participated in and were associated with this effort have just reason to be proud of the recommendations which evolved from the conference. They merit great praise. I personally would like to take this opportunity to commend them and urge that they submit their recommendations to the next session of the Maryland Legislature.

A young organization which has been very active in the field of traffic safety is the Safety First Club of Maryland, of which Mr. J. O. Shuger is president. This club was organized in February 1956 with the premise that "Traffic safety is everybody's business." This group, composed of many outstanding and civic minded citizens of the State of Maryland, is endeavoring to help educate the public to the meaning of traffic courtesy and safety. The Safety First Club has sponsored safety forums over the radio and at public libraries. They have erected a billboard dramatizing Maryland's tragic traffic toll, and as part of its effort the club has presented two driver education scholarships to the University of Maryland. The members have spent time and effort supporting legislation for traffic safety before the Maryland State Legislature. The program of this organization has been endorsed by leading safety experts in the State.

Most recently, the Fraternal Order of the Knights of Pythias, whose principles are friendship, charity, and benevolence, has joined in this effort. The order has formed a highway courtesy and safety committee to promote highway safety, and is conducting a nationwide highway courtesy campaign. As part of this campaign, they are urging that each motorist have in his car an inexpensive, self-contained, portable safety device for his car—a device that not 1 in 50 motorists currently carries. This device is considered so essential by public utilities commissions that trucks and other common carriers are required by law to carry a similar device at all times. This device has saved literally thousands of lives, and will serve, through its promotions and use, as a constant reminder of the danger of careless use of our roads,

thereby awakening many drivers to their responsibilities to themselves and others.

This item is an automatic safety flare. It comes in a compact carton of three and fits easily into the glove compartment. The flares burn for 15 minutes each, or a total of 45 minutes, with a bright red flame. They are so constructed, with a spike in the base, that they can be stuck in the ground or held in the hand while burning. The flare contains a self-igniting unit for the benefit of those who might not have a match handy.

In recognition of the nationwide campaign of the Fraternal Order of the Knights of Pythias, Gov. J. Millard Tawes, proclaimed the week of February 15 through February 21 Knights of Pythias Highway Courtesy Week in Maryland. In addition, each house of the Maryland Legislature, during its most recent session, passed a resolution commending the Knights of Pythias for its sponsorship of Highway Courtesy Week.

The resolution read as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 35

Resolution commending the Fraternal Order of the Knights of Pythias for its sponsorship of Highway Courtesy Week

Whereas throughout the United States and North America, traffic accidents continue to take a shocking toll in human life; and

Whereas a vast majority of these accidents are avoidable, and, indeed, are caused by thoughtlessness and a lack of common courtesy among many users of our roads; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of the Knights of Pythias is among the groups leading an extensive and continuing campaign of education in order to eliminate this condition; and

Whereas the Knights of Pythias have been conducting a continentwide highway courtesy campaign, and are advocating the setting aside of a prescribed week to lay emphasis on this project and arouse the populace in general to continue cognizance of the importance of caution and courtesy on the part of all motorists; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland, has proclaimed the week of February 15 through February 21, 1959, to be Knights of Pythias Highway Courtesy Week in Maryland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the Fraternal Order of Knights of Pythias be commended for its sponsorship of Highway Courtesy Week; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to Grand Chancellor J. Walter McKee, 651 Baker Street, Cumberland, Md., and Grand Secretary William H. Waters, Box 217, Gaithersburg, Md.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the efforts in this much needed field of activity. The public must be made aware of the facts. Highway accidents yearly take more lives than all the wars in which the United States has participated. The need for traffic courtesy and safety cannot be stressed too much nor repeated too often. The need has never been greater.

The public becomes enraged at various breaches of the peace. And rightly so. But, all too often the murder on our

highways goes unnoticed; that is, until it strikes close to home and it is then too late to teach what should have been practiced from the beginning. It is far better and wiser to be late for an appointment than not to arrive at all because of an accident.

Let us not forget that by practicing and preaching safety and courtesy on our highways—the life we save may be our own.

NEW WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to set at rest what appears to be a general impression that there is some kind of a deadline of June 1 on the enactment of new wheat legislation. There appears to be the impression that unless a wheat bill is enacted into law before June 1, the Secretary of Agriculture will be required to take some action on that date which he would not otherwise take or will not be able to take some action which he should take. There is no foundation in law or in fact for either impression. It is entirely false.

On June 1, 1959—that is next Monday—the Secretary of Agriculture is required by existing law to proclaim the national acreage allotment and the national marketing quota for the 1960 crop of wheat. The original date in the law for making these announcements is May 15, but by special joint resolution passed about 3 weeks ago, Congress set the date for this one year back to June 1. It was set back in the hope that a wheat bill might be agreed upon and signed into law before that time. At that time, it was not known what the nature of the wheat legislation might be, so that it seemed possible that the proclamation which the Secretary would be required to make on June 1 might be affected by the then pending legislation.

Since then, the shape of the wheat legislation on both sides of the Capitol has become evident and both the bill which has been passed by the Senate and the bill which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture of the House require that the Secretary make the very same proclamation next Monday that he would make if no wheat bill were passed this year.

On Monday, next, the Secretary of Agriculture will announce a national acreage allotment of 55 million acres for the 1960 crop of wheat and a national marketing quota representing the yield in bushels from 55 million acres. As soon as this proclamation has been made, the national acreage allotment can be broken down to State allotments, the State allotments to county allotments, and the county committees can go to work breaking down their county allotment into farm allotments.

This must be done before the provisions of either the Senate bill or the House bill can be put into effect, since both of these bills bring about a reduction in wheat acreage, not at the National, State, or county level, but by a percentage reduction of the farm acreage allotment which is arrived at on the basis of a national allotment of 55 million acres.

Thus, on Monday next, the Secretary of Agriculture will be doing only what he is required to do under the provisions of both the House and the Senate wheat bill. He will also be doing what he is required to do under existing provisions of law.

There is no reason for extending further the date on which the Secretary makes this announcement, nor is there any reason, Mr. Speaker, for trying to rush through Congress, merely on account of the June 1 announcement, the wheat legislation which is now pending.

I might add that the counsel of the Committee on Agriculture has been in touch with high-ranking officials of the Department of Agriculture within the past 2 hours, and they have flatly stated that there is no reason why the Secretary cannot make his scheduled announcement on June 1 and that they are not in favor of postponing further the date of this announcement.

AN EIGHT-POINT PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN EDUCATION—THE TIME FOR ACTION IS OVERDUE

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of the Congress a comprehensive eight-point legislative program for improving education. This program is designed to more fully insure our national security and to fortify America's ability to meet its world leadership responsibilities.

The recently issued report by the President's Science Advisory Committee has underscored the crisis in American education. Similar reports, mounting in number, have been made by highly regarded commissions and educational bodies. The time for action is overdue.

The Congress recognized the need to improve the quality of our education by the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which marks a significant contribution toward our efforts to achieve urgently needed educational improvement at many levels. This coordinated program is designed to strengthen national defense by assisting State, local, and private efforts in the development of America's human resources. In my opinion, however, even broader measures are required to effect the long-range upgrading of American education.

The program which I propose would include provisions for Federal assistance for elementary and secondary school construction; 50,000 annual college scholarship grants; 5,000 fellowship postcollege research and study; Federal grants for construction of State and municipal colleges and college research and laboratory facilities; grants for developing pilot teaching programs; revision of our tax law so as to permit parents to take reasonable deductions for children attending college; and assistance for adult education.

The tasks which we face in the field of education today are gigantic. They are the inevitable outcome of long years of neglect, of lazy approaches, and, in fact, of outright indifference to the obligations which have been thrust upon us by world events. Not only are the current educational challenges of this Nation gigantic, but they also involve highly complicated, many faceted problems, which require solutions within the framework of our system of Federal-State relations.

It is my hope, in view of the seriousness of our education needs, that political motives will be laid aside in the formulation of a sound and vigorous educational policy for a stronger America. The rewards, both social and economic, of an adequate educational program are great.

The current crisis in international affairs is the outcome of a struggle between the free world, whose peoples look to our country for leadership, and the unfortunate victims of the international gangster conspiracy of the Soviet Union. We are well aware of the Soviet engagement in a relentless, often subtle, and always persistent quest for world domination. The Soviet Union relentlessly seeks to further this conspiracy by leadership in the scientific revolution which began with the release of atomic energy. This Nation was shocked to learn in the past year that the Soviet Union has made substantial strides in the field of education and some persons have warned that we can no longer boast a superiority in this vital field.

But, the Russian technological accomplishments are not necessarily the result of superiority in the Soviet system of education or science research. Singleness of purpose and concentration of material and effort at the expense of other activities are undoubtedly the basic reasons for these accomplishments. However, if the Soviet Union's singleness of purpose and educational system are equal to the kind of project evidenced by the sputnik, obviously then this same combination is capable of other equally significant achievements. Certainly, no one questions this fact.

Furthermore, when these two educational systems—one of a free society and one of an enslaved society—are viewed against the backgrounds of basically different ways of life, I think you will agree that we would be traitorous to our traditions of freedom if we even tried to imitate the Soviet Union in its rigid, inflexible educational system.

The Communists inherited from czarist Russia an authoritarian but compe-

tent system of education to which only a small minority of the people had access. Following their advent to power in 1917 the Communists instituted a number of departures from the czarist system, but in the 1930's they again turned to that system. Most of these methods are maintained today. Although education has been made more accessible to the Soviet people and illiteracy has been drastically reduced, the purposes of education under the Soviet system are still based on the principle that the individual is trained to serve the needs of the state. People are educated in the Soviet Union, then, merely for the development of state-needed skills and to inculcate them with enthusiasm for Soviet imperialism.

In America, on the other hand, we educate for the development of each individual's potential. Our free society is a source of strength, and I have unshaken confidence in its correctness and its eventual world victory. We must, however, know the facts as they are, face them, and direct our energies to remedy those imperfections which interfere with the full development of our national reservoirs of greatness.

American scientific and cultural talent which is not fully developed represents a great loss and waste of valuable manpower. Perhaps some of the anti-intellectualism which exists today has resulted from a general failure of past generations to establish respect for learning. Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, has decried our attitude toward education. "The relative strength in fundamental research of the European countries," he stated, "is the result of their general respect for learning, for teaching, and for fundamental research, an attitude which we as a people have never had to the same degree."

Moreover, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report observes that the American people have never been quite prepared to face the fact that the Nation's need for good education is immediate; and good education is expensive. The legislative program which I propose would insure a much needed upgrading of our educational system. This will require substantial financial support. I am fully aware that money alone, of course, will not suffice to do the job. Equally as important as financial support are leadership and home and community attitudes toward learning.

Last year the Congress made a significant contribution toward providing assistance to some of our educational programs through the enactment of the National Defense Education Act. In my opinion, much needs to be done to expand and extend the programs of this legislation. The Congress, it is clear, will have to again take the initiative in the present national crisis in education. Clearly, the demands of our times require an effective and adequate educational program of school construction; scholarships; fellowships; assistance for research laboratories; improving the recruitment, training, and retention of teachers; assistance to institutions of

higher education; and the establishment of a commission to promote national understanding of the needs of our educational system. These are among the major emphases of my proposed legislative program.

Before I describe more fully my eight-point program I want to state that I do not favor Federal control of education. Direction and supervision of personnel, the formulation of programs of instruction are primarily a responsibility of the States. Moreover, no interferences with private institutions are intended or suggested in my proposals. I recognize and appreciate the tremendous contributions that have been made by these institutions, particularly in the field of higher education. Indeed, it is my hope that increased Federal concern for education will encourage comparable improvement in the private colleges and universities and that they will receive a share of the Federal grants whenever possible.

The issue of Federal control, however, is too often used as an argument against all Federal assistance, without regard for the nationwide critical classroom shortage and the apparent inability of the States to relieve it adequately, and also without regard for the existing and growing crisis in higher education. As a Nation, we have engaged in a number of forms of Federal assistance to State and local educational programs, and none of them has led to Federal control. I refer, for example, to the substantial aid to land-grant colleges, the school lunch program, assistance for vocational education, and the huge grants for both the construction and for the operation of schools in federally affected areas.

My legislative program for education is as follows:

First, I support the enactment of one or the other of the following two proposals: (a) Emergency grants to the States for school construction, or (b) a Federal support program to assist the States and local communities in remedying the inadequacies in the number of their teachers, the size of teachers' salaries, and the shortage of classrooms.

The emergency grant proposal would provide a \$3 billion matching-basis appropriation for local public elementary and secondary school construction, to be given to the States in five annual installments of \$600 million. This temporary program designed to meet the pressing classroom shortage is similar to the bill introduced in 1957 by the late Representative Augustine B. Kelley. The Kelley bill was defeated in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, but I believe that the recently revealed inadequacies of our educational facilities and the inability of the States adequately to finance much needed school construction have alerted the Congress to the need for reexamining methods by which we can improve our national educational policies and facilities throughout the country for our growing school-age population.

This proposal for emergency school construction grants to the States, in my opinion, strikes at a basic shortcoming in American education—the serious lack of adequate classrooms for public ele-

mentary and secondary school education. The formula for allocations to the States under this measure takes into account not only the school-age population within each State, but also the efforts which it can be expected to make, and provides that within a State the money can be allocated to local areas where the greatest classroom shortage exists.

My other proposal—H.R. 5671—which would grant Federal support for school construction as well as teachers' salaries, in my estimation, is a significant step in the direction of solving an important crisis in American education. It would provide adequate financial support to supplement the inadequate revenues available from the local property tax and State support.

H.R. 5671 would authorize an appropriation to each State of \$25 for each school-age child in fiscal 1960, \$50 for fiscal 1961, \$75 for fiscal 1962, and \$100 for each fiscal year thereafter.

Decisions as to whether the funds are to be spent for teachers' salaries, for school construction or basic equipment, or as to how they are to be divided between these two broad areas are left to the State education agencies.

Funds under my bill would be allocated to the States on the basis of the ratio of a State's estimated school-age population to the total estimated school-age population of all the States subject to the application of a State's effort index to the national effort index. The use of the effort index will help assure maintenance of State and local support at present levels.

H.R. 5671 calls for three-level governmental financial support for our schools. The need for this type of support was underscored by Dr. Ruth A. Stout, president of the National Education Association, in her testimony this year on behalf of this kind of Federal legislation. Dr. Stout pointed out that:

It should be obvious to all of us that our survival depends upon high quality education for all American youth. It should be equally obvious that the three levels of Government have a shared responsibility for financing the public school systems to provide this quality education. Not only must the educational systems in a democracy provide the means for each individual to develop his incentive and ability in order to achieve to his maximum capacity; in addition, the citizens of our Nation are entitled to an education which preserves respect for the individual and prepares him to live with and respect others like him or different from him.

Dr. Stout also emphasized the fact that:

Today there is much concern about strengthening and improving various phases of our school program. Regardless of the area under consideration, however, we find two elements at the heart of our problem: a competent teacher and an appropriate classroom. Until the Congress provides funds to meet these two important needs, we cannot hope to provide the quality of education citizens of the United States are demanding and must demand.

H.R. 22, to which my bill, H.R. 5671, is similar, was favorably reported by our House Committee on Education and La-

bor on May 14, 1959, and is now awaiting floor action.

In my opinion, these persistent defects—shortage of classrooms and inadequate teachers' salaries—clearly frustrate our ability to go forward not only in the fields of mathematics and the social sciences but also in research and higher education generally.

We need to recast the outlook of many persons in relation to the teaching profession, restore its dignity, improve the conditions of teaching, and increase teacher salaries substantially. The estimated national average salary of teachers in public schools for the school year 1957-58 is \$4,520, and 20 States pay an average salary of less than \$4,000. Median salaries for college teaching at large universities in 1956 were \$4,000 for instructors, \$4,900 for assistant professors, \$5,700 for associate professors, and \$7,000 for full professors.

Accordingly, a full-scale study exposing local variations and the penurious practices generally, and particularly in relation to the faculties of colleges, seems desirable. The Federal Government can do a good deal of prodding in this area among State legislators, other State officials, and among private educational institutions.

The present low salaries of elementary and secondary schoolteachers and college faculty members are a positive inducement for talented persons to seek employment in the more highly paid private industries. Teacher salaries should be raised and the dignity of the teaching profession reestablished so that the teaching profession will be able effectively to compete with private industry for skilled and competent persons.

Also for the record, here are some facts concerning the classroom shortage. Based on a survey conducted among State education agencies by the U.S. Office of Education, it is estimated that the national classroom shortage at the start of the 1958 school year amounted to approximately 140,500 classrooms. Of these 140,500 additional instruction rooms needed at the beginning of this year, 65,300 rooms were reported necessary to accommodate the 1,843,000 pupils enrolled in excess of normal capacity and 75,200 to replace facilities considered obsolete or otherwise unsatisfactory. Of the 33.9 million children enrolled in schools in the fall of 1958—an increase of 3.5 percent over the previous fall—there was no room for 1.8 million. In many areas children have half-day schedules because of lack of facilities.

Under our traditional system of education, the major responsibility for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools rests with local school districts—of which there are approximately 54,000 in the States. These local school districts issue bonds to secure the needed money. The money to pay the school-construction bonds is derived from taxes levied on property located in the school district.

School districts which are rich in property get along nicely, and usually have fine schools to show for their property wealth. Unfortunately, in thou-

sands of poorer local communities the school districts lack sufficient property wealth for issuing bonds to finance necessary school construction.

Now some people tell us that the Federal Government should not intervene in the field of education; that the matter should be left to the States. But an examination of State assistance made in 1956-57 by the United States Office of Education revealed that no State assistance whatever was given to local districts for schoolhouse construction in the following 17 States: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, and Wyoming.

Moreover, in most of the remaining States little more than token assistance for this purpose was reported. Programs for State aid to education, such as the highly developed system in New York, gave assistance to local communities for the operation of their schools as distinguished from State aid for school construction.

The Federal Government has had abundant experience with large-scale Federal assistance not only for the construction of schools but also for their maintenance and operation. I refer, of course, to Public Laws 874 and 815, which apply to Federally impacted areas. These laws, first enacted in 1950 and annually extended since then, were based on the view that the Federal Government should share the cost of education in areas where, because of Federal activities such as military installations or other Federal projects, the population increases beyond the financial ability of local school districts. From 1950 through fiscal year 1958 a total of more than \$618 million was appropriated under Public Law 874 for assisting in the maintenance and operation of schools, and more than \$800 million was appropriated under Public Law 815 for assisting in the construction of school facilities.

As I have stated, the programs of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 have extended substantial and continued Federal assistance not only for school construction but also for the maintenance and operation of schools. The 3,344 local school districts which received assistance under these laws made contributions for these purposes under formulas established in the laws. Significantly, there have been no outcries heard against either of these laws, no authoritative claims that they have resulted in Federal control of education.

Indeed, a searching study made public in 1957 by Columbia University's Teachers College concluded that, among school districts receiving Federal aid under Public Law 874, "Federal control over school personnel, the curriculum, and institutional programs had not accompanied the distribution of funds." The enactment of these laws broke valuable ground by showing how the Federal Government, without interference or control, can cooperate with the States in improving their educational systems.

My proposal, for emergency school construction assistance, is similar to the Kelly bill, and it extends this successfully tested method of Federal-State cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot ignore, we cannot be indifferent to, the revealed shortcomings in our system of primary and secondary school education. They are too enormous. With the growth of population these shortcomings will inevitably become more critical. They are a fertile source of illiteracy, a source of national shame. Our self-respect and our world leadership responsibilities dictate that these educational inadequacies be corrected.

Second, I propose a program of 50,000 annual college scholarship grants to be awarded to the highest scorers in national competitive examinations. The minimum scholarship amount would be \$500 yearly for a 4-year period, but the amount could be increased to \$1,500 for needy students. My proposal provides that the examinations be given and that the program be administered jointly by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education. The top 20 percent of the scholarship winners would be awarded a scholarship without regard to the State in which they reside; the remaining scholarships would be awarded in each State in proportion to its population. Recipients of scholarships would be free to attend institutions of their choice.

I was extremely disappointed last year when the National Defense Education Act was passed without a provision for scholarships. During the 85th Congress, I urged that a Federal scholarship program be enacted. It was my thinking at that time, and it is still my thinking, that the reports, studies, and testimonies of various educational authorities present overwhelming evidence of the need for Federal legislation in this area. The failure of the Congress to enact an educational measure which would provide for adequate scholarship assistance to students represents a disregard of the facts which highlight the national need for scholarships.

After viewing the enormity of the problems we face in the field of education and the grave consequences of our continuing to ignore them, my proposal for 50,000 annual college scholarships will seem a modest one. Nor is the suggested amount of the scholarship award more than meager in view of a recent U.S. Office of Education estimate which reported that the average cost of attending college is now between \$1,500 and \$2,000 a year, or between \$6,000 and \$8,000 for a 4-year education. A recent survey conducted at the request of the National Science Foundation showed that annually 150,000 above-average high school students in our country do not go to college because they lack financial means.

Among the greatest resources of our Nation are the talents of our gifted youth. Yet existing programs for helping our competent young people to secure a college education, admirable though they may be and though they have been increasing in the last decade, still do not

go far enough. A 1957 study made by the Office of Education showed that the 1,332 reporting institutions offered a total of 227,909 scholarships.

This report further shows that approximately 21,000 students received scholarships in excess of \$625 each. These scholarship students constituted only 9.2 percent of the total group of scholarship students. At the other extreme, almost one-third, or 72,435, of all scholarship winners received grants of less than \$125.

Because I believe that we have neglected the needs of many of our talented youth, I have incorporated in my scholarship proposal the provision for a national scholarship examination. In my opinion these exams should be given nationally. In this manner we could test the efficiency of State systems rather than be limited by them. As Professor Arthur Bestor of the University of Illinois, founder and former president of the Council for Basic Education, has recently stated:

If Federal funds are to go into educational testing, I believe that they should go for building up an independent nationwide system of examinations that would test, by a common standard, the results of the operations of our * * * separate State school systems.

Through such a system of scholarship examinations, we could get a clear picture of the Nation's educational resources. A well-developed Federal education agency should have purview over all educational matters, with regional offices located throughout the United States charged with the responsibility of carrying out the Federal purposes.

As a corollary of this view, scholarships should not be apportioned among the States entirely according to their population. This method would probably result in denial of scholarships to brighter students in some places to make room for those who had lower scores but reside in areas where fewer students competed or the average I.Q. was lower. It is my hope, therefore, that an acceptable compromise would lie in excluding the top 20 percent of scholarship winners from the rule of apportionment among the States.

This Nation is not without experience in the field of direct Federal grants to individuals for higher education. The National Youth Administration in the 1930's made substantial grants for college and graduate students. At its peak in 1936-37, \$16,225,994 was spent in assisting 180,900 students. Under the veterans education benefits provisions of the GI bill, as of February 1959, 3,400,000 students had attended or were attending colleges and universities.

One should not overlook either the billions of dollars spent by the Federal Government as part of its military training programs. A substantial amount of this money might be saved if we improve education generally and thus reduce the number of illiterate persons who must be trained for work by our armed services.

Third, A program of 5,000 annual fellowship grants and a \$1 billion revolving low-interest loan fund for graduate

study would, in my opinion, strengthen and expand the fellowship provision of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. At present only 1,000 fellowships are authorized by the act for fiscal year 1959 and only 1,500 for each of three succeeding fiscal years. The inadequacy of this number of fellowships is underscored by the fact that by December 31, 1958, the U.S. Office of Education had received 1,040 program applications asking for 5,987 fellowships—almost six times the number provided in the act.

The national need for general education predominates among the considerations which dictate the creation of scholarships for college study. The situation is somewhat different in connection with post-college study, though often it is difficult to draw lines; approximate areas, rather than rigid lines of demarcation, are suggested. Speaking generally, though, governmental assistance in post-college study or training is more than justified for developing nationally needed skills.

I envision that fellowship grants for post-college study will be readily made in fields where the need for research is demonstrated or where critical shortages of skills exist—especially shortages of teachers, scientists, mathematicians, and engineers. Our current shortage of qualified teachers is a national scandal. It prevents full utilization of existing educational facilities, and frustrates our plans to expand these facilities for accommodating our growing population.

The need to expand the fellowship provision of the National Defense Education Act is quite obvious in the light of the facts. This provision is good as far as it goes, but it shows an unduly modest appraisal of the need, and the preference to teacher training is not warranted. Indeed, the total adequacy is contradicted by the need for research and training in other proven fields which are closely related to the national interest.

I also believe that qualified persons whose area of study or competitive standing is not sufficient to justify a fellowship grant should not be denied the opportunity of pursuing graduate study for developing skills or for pursuing higher forms of learning. For this purpose I propose a low-interest loan fund especially for graduate study. This loan fund is intended to point up the fact that, as a Nation, we have been content to go along with inadequate measures for the development of our great resources of talents and abilities. A large number of our people have had to work at tasks below their aptitudes for the lack of training. This will no longer suffice.

We are not without experience in the field of student loans or Federal fellowship grants. For example, between the years 1942 and 1944, 11,053 loans were granted to students under the Federal Government student war loan program. Administered by the U.S. Office of Education, this program provided loans to students in technical and professional fields. Already the applications for participation in the loan program of the

National Defense Education Act have been made by institutions in nearly every State in the Union. As of February 1959, the U.S. Commissioner of Education reported that 1,231 institutions are participating in the new program. The institutional requests submitted totaled over \$62 million. I think overwhelming response to the loan provision of the Education Act is, in itself, substantial evidence of a growing tendency among students today to borrow for their education. Attention was called to this trend as early as 1957 when the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School observed that the idea of borrowing for an education is gaining recognition. The committee pointed out that "it is highly desirable that the use of loans for college education be popularized."

The fellowship awards of the National Science Foundation provide an example of Federal assistance to students in the form of a grant. So also are Fulbright scholarships for advanced study which support American student study abroad and foreign student study in this country. From the beginning of the Fulbright program in 1948 through the calendar year 1958, a total of 37,358 persons have participated in this program. The cost of this program to the American people, however, has been relatively small because of the predominant use of foreign currencies obtained through counterpart funds in paying for the scholarship grants.

Fourth, I suggest a \$1 billion program of Federal grants for construction of State and municipal colleges, and college laboratory and other educational facilities. Like my proposal for Federal aid for elementary and secondary school construction, the proposed college assistance would be given on a matching basis by the States, and would prohibit discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or religion. Selection of proposed construction plans submitted by State or local authorities would be made jointly by the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation, guided by congressionally established standards which would take into account factors such as population requirements in the 18 to 24 age group, existing college facilities, local financial ability, and local efforts in the field of higher education.

Our colleges and universities will have to handle twice as many students by 1970, despite the fact that many of these institutions have laboratories and other educational facilities which are in a state of appalling disrepair and obsolescence. For example, the great need for construction of college facilities may be demonstrated by a recent report of a Columbia University faculty committee, which recommended that Columbia should spend \$100 million for building expansion.

In the next decade college enrollments are expected to increase at a faster rate than either elementary or secondary school enrollments, because the size of the 18-24 age group will increase about 61 percent as compared with an estimated total population increase of about

20 percent. The States have a heavy responsibility for expanding the facilities for higher education which these population requirements will bring about, and which may be expected to increase through the expanded scholarship and other educational programs which are contemplated. The rate of college attendance among those in the 18-21 age bracket has been increasing steadily. In 1900 it had risen to 10 percent; in 1950 it was nearly 30 percent; and today it stands at about 34 percent.

I do not know whether the States will be able to meet these increasing responsibilities. In 1957 the voters of New York State, by a majority of more than 1 million votes, approved a \$250 million bond issue for strengthening and expanding the State University. I cannot report comparable activity in any other State.

Increasing financial support for higher education by State and local governments should be pressed with all energy. But Federal assistance is also imperative. This was recognized by the Josephs committee, whose report stated:

The committee also recognizes, however, that some of the present forms of Federal support must also be continued and certain new forms provided. In the competition for State dollars, education is presently at a severe disadvantage in relations to such other claimants as hospitals and highways for which the Federal Government matches State appropriations at attractive ratios.

Apparently impressed by the widening gap between our country's needs and its efforts in higher education, the Association of American Colleges recently renounced its traditional opposition to direct Federal support.

We already help to finance the construction and repair of colleges and college facilities through our Federal tax-deduction laws, but this does not insure that the money will be given where it is needed most. A program of direct Federal assistance, closely defined so as to prevent Federal control, would afford a better means of relating improvement in college plants to the public interest.

Fifth, A \$100 million fund for grants for development of pilot programs for evolving new teaching and research methods, particularly in the fields of the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering, is certainly needed.

The fields of education have been radically altered, particularly in the physical sciences, as a result of atomic energy. And our world leadership responsibilities have resulted in burdens which we have not fully comprehended in the study of foreign languages, diplomacy, and in the knowledge of foreign affairs. To persist in following outdated teaching methods in these significant areas is folly.

Developing new teaching methods, particularly in the fields of the physical sciences, is a national problem and, therefore, a national responsibility requiring the development of full-scale pilot programs. The proposed \$100 million grant, if put to proper use under the joint sponsorship of the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education, could result in substantial savings

through increased efficiency, and would also constitute an invaluable guide for local educational systems, each of which would otherwise be obliged to expend substantial sums of money for this purpose.

Considerable attention has been called to the effective utilization of certain mass media for educational purposes. We have heard a lot about educational television and other audiovisual aids. It seems to me, however, that we have somewhat neglected a very fundamental need to train persons in the basic skills of teaching. We must not neglect classroom method and the role of the instructor in the total learning process. The development of new teaching and research methods is unquestionably basic and vital to a sound educational program. The support of research in these areas combined with experimentation in the use of certain media for educational purposes, and the strengthening of science, mathematics and modern foreign language instruction, such as provided in the National Defense Education Act, will undergird our total program in education.

Sixth, I would like to see the establishment of a program to permit parents to take a reasonable income tax deduction for student college expenses.

In view of other Federal tax deduction policies, the refusal of the Federal Government to allow a tax deduction for student expenses is unreasonable and illogical. The U.S. Office of Education has estimated that the average cost of attending college is now between \$1,500 and \$2,000 a year, or between \$6,000 and \$8,000 for a 4-year education. For families with several children who want to attend college, the financing of such education poses a formidable, and often insurmountable, obstacle.

With this in mind, I support the proposal that a taxpayer be allowed to deduct such expenses in calculating his Federal income tax. In 1944 our tax law was revised so as to permit a taxpayer to take a \$600 annual deduction for each dependent over 18 years of age who was continuing his schooling.

This is entirely inadequate. We allow deductions for medical expenses because we recognize that unduly large doctor bills may constitute an income drain too substantial for the taxpayer's ability to absorb. And by allowing deductions for charitable contributions, which can include money given to educational institutions, the Government in effect recognizes that payments for education may be subtracted from income taxes provided these payments are for other people's children. This is paradoxical. Why, then, not allow a reasonable deduction to a taxpayer for money spent in educating his own child?

Seventh, I further suggest a \$100 million appropriation to help defray the cost of local programs for adult education.

Millions of adults are now frustrated in their efforts to continue their education, either as a means of enriching their lives or to gain occupational advancement. It has been estimated that more

than 49 million adults participate in adult educational programs sponsored by university extension and evening college programs, religious institutions, health and welfare agencies, private correspondence schools and other agencies, including the agricultural extension program. This is a remarkable expression of a desire for learning which should be encouraged.

The existing programs are noteworthy, but they are insufficient. We need a reappraisal and enlargement of opportunities in the field of adult education, both for the national good and for the requirements of adult individuals. A large part of the present problem in adult education is the result of our failure to extend educational opportunities for adults during the period of their childhood and youth. There will be less need for huge expenditures in adult education if the job of education is adequately done in the elementary and secondary schools and in the colleges.

Eighth. In view of widespread criticism that the U.S. Office of Education is understaffed, insufficiently financed, and that it is not adequately organized to do an effective job—there should be established a Federal commission to investigate our educational system. The proposed commission would inquire into all possible aspects of National, State, and local educational policies, procedures, and shortcomings, and would include in its assigned mission a searching inquiry regarding: the training and compensation of teachers, Federal-State relations, the integration of secondary-school education with college programs, and our tax policies insofar as they relate to education. The proposed Commission would be given subpoena power to make its inquiries more effective, and would be authorized to make recommendations regarding matters falling within its jurisdiction.

At the outset of my statement I called attention to the fact that the current educational challenges before the Nation are many-faceted. In outlining my eight-point program of action I have tried to demonstrate just how involved our total educational picture has become.

We must give more than verbal recognition to the fact that education, along with national defense, is a frontline national responsibility as well as a means to strengthen the Nation's security. We must put into effect an active, efficient, and comprehensive program which will not only alleviate the current educational crisis but will also help to insure for the future an upgraded educational system with adequate Federal financial support.

MASS TRANSIT SYSTEMS ACROSS THE HUDSON RIVER

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, today the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New

Jersey and I are introducing joint resolutions to sanction the compact entered into by the States of New York and New Jersey by means of concurrent legislation—chapter 420 of "The Laws of New York of 1959" and chapter 13 of "The Laws of New Jersey of 1959," and also the act of March 4, 1959, of "The Laws of New Jersey"—for the development and execution of interim plans and the preparation of a long-range plan to deal with problems of mass transit systems for the transportation by common carrier of passengers to or across the Hudson River, or both, with respect to those phases with which either of the States, acting alone, cannot deal.

Congressman RODINO and I know that the transportation problems referred to are serious and pressing. Prompt action by the Congress is very important as the States cannot begin their investigations until they have this consent of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to exercise the prerogative of the minority leader, but before going on to the special orders for today, I wonder if the minority leader is going to ask about the program for the balance of the week and whether any announcement is going to be made.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman that I spoke to the acting majority leader on the Democratic side, who suggested to me that we could say something about the program tomorrow, although, so far as I know, it will be according to what the whip notice carries except possibly that there would be no record votes tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. According to the agreement that has been made, if any record vote is requested tomorrow, it is our purpose that it go over until Tuesday. So far as bills to be taken up, the program is the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYS. My purpose was to clarify the situation as to just what would happen in the event a rollcall vote was asked on the bill which has been debated today.

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, while the Reorganization Act expires on June 1, it is not the sort of deadline situation that would exist, for instance, where an excise tax law would expire. The Reorganization Act will become effective immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). The Chair will state with reference to the bill which has been under consideration today that it would be the intention to bring that up on Tuesday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes, except on rules which may be requested tomorrow or Monday, be put over until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules on the bill H.R. 3088, an immigration bill, and H.R. 88, the military facilities bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Oklahoma has specified two bills which will be taken up under suspension of the rules. As I have indicated heretofore in view of certain circumstances, it is perfectly all right with me that the suspensions come on Tuesday instead of on Monday. Of course, it would be in order under the rules to take them up under suspension on Monday, but since it suits the convenience of a number of Members, it is perfectly agreeable to me that the suspensions should come on Tuesday next.

The question has been raised here as to whether or not there would be any suspensions on Monday. I assume from our agreement that there will be no suspensions on Monday, but that there will be two suspensions on Tuesday to which the gentleman from Oklahoma referred.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that he has no knowledge of any suspensions other than the two that have been mentioned and the Chair would commit himself to that, as Acting Speaker, knowing that the two that have been mentioned have been cleared by me with the Speaker. Of course, if anything of an emergency nature comes up I would make the usual reservation in that event so far as Monday is concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; of course, that is understood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ENACTMENT OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL WOULD AID THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AMONG MANY OTHER STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the information of my colleagues Area Redevelopment Fact Sheet No. 61, which contains a breakdown of the distressed and labor surplus areas in the State of New York. This information was compiled by the Area Employment Expansion Committee with headquarters in New York City.

I feel it is important to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this data indicates that one major labor market, Utica-Rome, as well as 11 smaller areas would become eligible immediately for benefits under the area redevelopment bill, which has been sent by the House Banking and Currency Committee to the Rules Committee where it is awaiting action by that body.

This fact sheet further discloses the conditions in the Buffalo labor market as being one of substantial labor surplus where the unemployment rate in that city in January of this year was 12.3 percent.

I am also submitting, Mr. Speaker, a copy of an article on the Buffalo labor market which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 27, 1959, entitled "Beleaguered Buffalo." In this article, the long-term economic problems facing Buffalo are enumerated. They are essentially the difficulties that are arising from increased productivity shift of industry from Buffalo and the changes in the methods of military procurement and the conversion from airplane to missile production. Buffalo will become eligible as a distressed area in July of this year, and it should be given the benefits of the provisions contained in the area redevelopment bill.

I trust that my colleagues will take the time to examine this Wall Street Journal article with care, for it illustrates dramatically the mounting problems with which even large diversified communities like Buffalo are faced in the midst of our changing economy.

We must have, Mr. Speaker, legislation providing Federal facilities for aid to these distressed communities.

The indicated material is herewith submitted:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT FACT SHEET No. 61: NEW YORK STATE

The Empire State is among those which would benefit from the proposed area redevelopment legislation. While the total number of areas immediately affected constitutes a somewhat smaller proportion of the total of the State than is prevalent in other States where there are more chronically distressed areas, yet the problems are none the less serious in this State.

In January 1959 there were 1 major labor market, Utica-Rome, and 11 smaller areas which would become eligible immediately for benefits under the area redevelopment bill (table I). Their total civilian labor force was over one-half million people, which probably represented some 6 percent of the State's working population (table II). The average rate of unemployment in these areas was 11.9 percent. It would take 29,865 new jobs to eliminate the unemployment in excess of 6 percent in these areas.

In addition, there were six major labor markets, four smaller labor markets, and three very small labor markets in which there was a substantial labor surplus. Continued high unemployment in these areas would graduate them into the chronically distressed state. It is probable that some of these areas will reach this condition.

There are 23 counties for which no labor market data are currently available.

DISTRESSED AREAS

A. Major labor market

Utica-Rome: This large labor market in central New York State, including both Oneida and Herkimer Counties, suffered seriously from the postwar contraction of the textile industry. It has struggled desperately to replace some of the textile jobs with new durable goods plants, but these have also been hard hit by unemployment. While these plants have opened up new jobs for the younger people, they have not provided job opportunities for the older population. As a result the rate of unemployment in the labor market in January 1959 was 11.8 percent.

The unemployment rate reached a high of 11.3 percent in January 1955, but had declined in the subsequent years reaching a low in the fall of 1956 (table III). In 1958 this labor market again suffered reverses so that the average unemployment rate for 1958 was 10.4 percent. The community needs considerable assistance to revamp its basic economic structure.

B. Smaller labor markets

Eleven smaller labor markets have had a high rate of unemployment for long enough periods to become eligible for benefits under the area redevelopment bill.

The following are the periods during which these smaller labor market areas have been certified as having had substantial labor surpluses:

Smaller Labor Market and Periods of Substantial Labor Surplus

Amsterdam: June 1954 through September 1956—March 1958 to date.

Auburn: January 1955 through July 1955—April 1958 to date.

Batavia: March 1958 to date.

Elmira: April 1958 to date.

Glens Falls-Hudson Falls: June 1958 to date.

Gloversville: November 1952 through September 1955—April 1958 to date.

Kingston: September 1958 to date.

Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon: July 1958 to date.

Oneida: June 1958 to date.

Plattsburgh: March 1959 to date.

Watertown: April 1958 to date.

Amsterdam: This textile community has suffered repeated setbacks from the closing of large textile mills. The shift of mills from this area to other States and the contraction of operations are the basic causes for its difficulties. The community has made desperate efforts to attract new plants. It has sponsored local industrial advances though individual improvements have been made.

The labor market includes Montgomery County. It has had annual average rates of unemployment of 9.4 percent in 1955; 9.8 percent in 1956; 8.9 percent in 1957, and 14.1 percent in 1958. In January 1959 the unemployment rate was 13.5 percent.

Auburn: Including as this labor market does Cayuga County, it has been a center of industrial activity except that it has suffered from plant closings and the contraction of some of its basic industries. Among the most significant closings was that of the International Harvester Co. Recently an electrical machinery company moved out of the area. Difficulties are being faced by other textile plants in the area. The annual average rate of unemployment in 1955 was 9.1 percent; in 1956, 7.1 percent; in 1957, 8.4 percent; and in 1958, 14.3 percent. Relief from continued high unemployment is not in sight.

Batavia: This labor market includes Genesee County. Its annual average rate of unemployment in 1957 was 8.8 percent and in 1958, 9.4 percent. While it was only recently certified as having substantial labor surpluses, it faces serious problems. Layoffs have occurred in its machinery and primary metal industries and many of its local residents must depend upon jobs in nearby areas for continued employment since the area does not itself support the population.

Elmira: This labor market includes Chemung County. Unemployment began to assume serious proportions in December 1957 and has continued at high levels through 1958 and in 1959. In February 1959 the rate was 11.1 percent. The community has suffered from widespread layoffs in machinery and the electrical equipment plants.

Glens Falls-Hudson Falls: This labor market includes both the counties of Warren and Washington. Unemployment was most marked in 1958 with reductions in the elec-

trical equipment, paper, and textile industries. In 1958 the average rate of unemployment was 9.7 percent.

Gloversville: This is one of the truly chronically distressed labor markets. It encompasses Fulton County. It suffers from the decline of the dress, glove, and the woolen knit glove industry. These have been adversely affected by imports. This area has been suffering from continuing high unemployment for a number of years. In 1955, the average rate of unemployment was 13 percent; in 1956, 9.3 percent; in 1957, 14.1 percent; and in 1958, 19.5 percent. In 1959, the rate was 17.9 percent in February. This is an area needing immediate and continuing attention.

Kingston: This labor market of Ulster County has suffered from the closing of a large machinery manufacturing plant, as well as losses in the aircraft, paper, and chemical industries. Only the seasonal pickups in the summer resort trade help offset these setbacks. The average rate of unemployment in 1958 was 8.1 percent and in January 1959, 10.4 percent.

Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon: This labor market includes Orange and Putnam Counties as well as the city of Beacon and the town of Fishkill in Dutchess County. There have been widespread layoffs in the apparel, textiles, leather goods, metals, and machinery industries. Many residents working in outside areas have also been adversely affected. The average rate of unemployment in 1958, was 9.7 percent. Much hope has been placed in the economic effects of the New York Thruway but these have not yet lived up to expectations.

Oneida: The Madison County labor market has also recently been added to the list of the distressed areas. There have been heavy cutbacks in the silverware industry. This is a community which needs long-term improvements. Residents have been working in outside areas and commuting and the cutbacks in these outside areas have adversely affected local people. The unemployment rate has been particularly high in 1958, with an annual average rate of 13.1 percent. Long-term redevelopment is essential.

Plattsburgh: This labor market includes Clinton County and has suffered from the long-term drop in construction and losses in mining industries. The average rate of unemployment in 1958 was 12.9 percent and unemployment continued at a high rate of 15 percent in February 1959.

Watertown: The Watertown labor market includes Jefferson County. The difficulties of this community are attributable to the decline in employment in the machinery and paper industries. The high unemployment rates were first noticeable in March 1957, and continued through all of 1958. The average rate of unemployment for 1958 was 11.6 percent.

Areas of Substantial Labor Surplus

In addition to the preceding distressed areas there are a number of labor markets with substantial labor surpluses. This condition has not been of sufficient duration to qualify them for the benefits of the act (table IV). These areas will become eligible as of the following dates:

Labor Market Area and Earliest Date of Future Eligibility

Corning-Hornell: June 1959.

Olean-Salamanca: June 1959.

Albany-Schenectady-Troy: July 1959.

Buffalo: July 1959.

New York: July 1959.

Syracuse: July 1959.

Jamesstown-Dunkirk: July 1959.

Orleans: September 1959.

Binghamton: October 1959.

Catskill: December 1959.

Watford-Mechanicville-Stillwater: January 1960.

Wellsville: January 1960.

Rochester: July 1960.

TABLE I.—New York State—Areas of substantial labor surplus, April 1959, by status of current eligibility and earliest date of future eligibility under the Kilburn, House Banking Committee recommendation, and Senate-adopted S. 722 bills

| Labor market area | Status of current eligibility | | | Earliest date of future eligibility | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Kilburn | House Banking Committee recommendation | Senate-adopted S. 722 | Kilburn | House Banking Committee recommendation | Senate-adopted S. 722 |
| MAJOR | | | | | | |
| Albany-Schenectady-Troy | | | | 1963 | July 1959 | 1962 |
| Binghamton | | | | 1963 | October 1959 | 1962 |
| Buffalo | | | | 1962 | July 1959 | 1961 |
| New York | | | | 1963 | do | 1962 |
| Rochester | | | | 1963 | July 1960 | 1962 |
| Syracuse | | | | 1963 | July 1959 | 1962 |
| Utica-Rome | X | | | 1962 | | 1961 |
| SMALLER | | | | | | |
| Amsterdam | X | X | X | | | |
| Auburn | | X | X | 1960 | | |
| Batavia | | X | | 1962 | | 1961 |
| Corning-Hornell | | | | 1962 | June 1959 | 1961 |
| Elmira | | X | | 1962 | | 1961 |
| Glens Falls-Hudson Falls | | X | | 1963 | | 1962 |
| Gloversville | X | X | X | | | |
| VERY SMALL | | | | | | |
| Jamestown-Dunkirk | | | | 1962 | July 1959 | 1961 |
| Kingston | | X | | 1963 | | 1962 |
| Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon | | X | | 1962 | | 1961 |
| Olean-Salamanca | | | | 1963 | June 1959 | 1962 |
| Oneida | | X | | 1961 | | 1960 |
| Plattsburgh | | X | | 1961 | | 1960 |
| Watertown | | X | X | 1960 | | 1962 |
| Wellsville | | | | 1963 | January 1960 | |
| Catskill | | | | 1963 | December 1959 | 1962 |
| Orleans | | | | 1963 | September 1959 | 1962 |
| Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater | | | | 1963 | January 1960 | 1962 |

TABLE II.—New York State—Labor force and unemployment in labor markets, January 1959

| Labor market area | Civilian labor force (total) | Unemployment total | Unemployment as percent of the labor force | Number in excess of 6 percent |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| A. State, total | (1) | (1) | | |
| B. Distressed areas ² | 505,250 | 60,180 | 11.9 | 29,865 |
| Major: Utica-Rome | 137,400 | 16,200 | 11.8 | 7,956 |
| Smaller | 367,850 | 43,980 | 12.0 | 21,909 |
| Amsterdam | 23,000 | 3,100 | 13.5 | 1,720 |
| Auburn ³ | 28,000 | 4,200 | 15.0 | 2,520 |
| Batavia ⁴ | 21,200 | 2,200 | 10.4 | 928 |
| Elmira ⁴ | 40,600 | 4,300 | 10.6 | 1,864 |
| Glens Falls-Hudson Falls ⁵ | 37,700 | 3,400 | 9.0 | 1,138 |
| Gloversville ⁴ | 23,450 | 5,000 | 21.3 | 3,593 |
| Kingston | 42,450 | 4,400 | 10.4 | 1,853 |
| Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon ⁶ | 78,400 | 7,630 | 9.7 | 2,926 |
| Oneida ⁷ | 17,850 | 2,150 | 12.0 | 1,079 |
| Plattsburgh ⁴ | 20,050 | 2,800 | 14.0 | 1,597 |
| Watertown ⁴ | 35,150 | 4,800 | 13.7 | 2,691 |
| Labor market area | Civilian labor force (total) | Unemployment total | Unemployment as percent of the labor force | Number in excess of 6 percent |
| C. Substantial labor surplus areas | 6,790,750 | 582,250 | 8.6 | 174,805 |
| Major | 6,612,950 | 564,200 | 8.5 | 167,423 |
| Albany-Schenectady-Troy | 245,100 | 21,800 | 8.9 | 7,094 |
| Binghamton | 94,400 | 7,300 | 7.7 | 1,636 |
| Buffalo | 526,500 | 64,500 | 12.3 | 32,910 |
| New York | 5,321,100 | 441,200 | 8.3 | 121,934 |
| Rochester | 249,600 | 15,200 | 6.1 | 224 |
| Syracuse | 176,250 | 14,200 | 8.1 | 3,625 |
| Smaller | 148,450 | 14,600 | 9.8 | 5,693 |
| Corning-Hornell ⁸ | 39,000 | 4,100 | 10.4 | 1,760 |
| Jamestown-Dunkirk ⁹ | 62,900 | 6,100 | 9.7 | 2,326 |
| Olean-Salamanca ⁴ | 31,150 | 2,950 | 9.5 | 1,081 |
| Wellsville ⁷ | 15,400 | 1,450 | 9.5 | 526 |
| Very small | 29,350 | 3,450 | 11.8 | 1,689 |
| Catskill ³ | 9,900 | 700 | 7.1 | 106 |
| Orleans ⁸ | 14,000 | 2,000 | 14.3 | 1,160 |
| Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater ⁹ | 5,450 | 750 | 13.8 | 423 |
| D. Other nonsubstantial labor surplus areas ¹⁰ | (1) | (1) | | |

¹ Information not available.² Eligible for assistance under the House Banking Committee recommendation; i.e., unemployment of 6 percent in at least 18 of the previous 24 months, 9 percent during at least 15 of the previous 18 months, 12 percent during the previous 12 months or 15 percent during the previous 6-month period.³ September 1958.⁴ January 1959.⁵ November 1958.]⁶ December 1958.]⁷ October 1958.⁸ June 1958.⁹ March 1959.¹⁰ Information not available for the following 11 small and 12 very small labor areas: Small areas: Chenango, Delaware, Dutchess, Hudson, Oneonta, Ontario, Oswego, Fulton, St. Lawrence, Saratoga, Tompkins, Wayne.

Very small: Cortland, Essex, Franklin, Hamilton, Lewis, Livingston, Schoharie, Schuyler, Seneca, Tioga, Wyoming, Yates.

Source: Division of Employment, Department of Labor, State of New York. Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE III.—New York State unemployment as percent of labor force in distressed areas, 1955-59¹

| Labor market area | Year | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. | Annual average |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------------|
| Major: Utica-Rome | 1955 | 11.3 | 10.1 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 6.6 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 7.6 |
| | 1956 | 8.0 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 5.1 | 5.3 |
| | 1957 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 6.5 | 7.8 | 5.5 |
| | 1958 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 12.0 | 11.7 | 11.1 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9.0 | 10.3 | 10.4 |
| | 1959 | 11.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Smaller: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Amsterdam | 1955 | 11.4 | 9.6 | 10.3 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 12.0 | 8.4 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 9.4 | 10.9 | 9.4 |
| | 1956 | 12.0 | 10.3 | 15.9 | 15.1 | 13.6 | 11.5 | 14.1 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 6.5 | 9.8 |
| | 1957 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 10.1 | 19.0 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 6.2 | 9.8 | 12.2 | 8.9 |
| | 1958 | 15.3 | 16.1 | 15.1 | 13.8 | 13.6 | 15.5 | 18.0 | 13.2 | 11.5 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 13.0 | 14.1 |
| | 1959 | 13.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE IV.—New York State unemployment as percent of labor force in areas of substantial labor surplus, 1955-59—Continued

| Labor market area | Year | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. | Annual average |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|----------------|
| Smaller—Continued | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jamestown-Dunkirk..... | 1955 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1956 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1957 | | | | | | | | | 2.4 | | | | |
| | 1958 | | | | | | | 13.8 | | 9.7 | | | | 11.8 |
| | 1959 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Olean-Salamanca..... | 1955 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1956 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1957 | | | | | | | | 3.0 | | | | | |
| | 1958 | | | 8.4 | | | | | 7.6 | | | | | 8.0 |
| | 1959 | 9.5 | 9.5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wellsville..... | 1955 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1956 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1957 | | | | | | | | | | | 4.5 | | |
| | 1958 | | | | | | | | | | 9.5 | | | |
| Very small: Catskill..... | 1955 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1956 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1957 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1958 | | | | | | | | | 7.1 | | | | |
| | 1959 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Very small: Orleans..... | 1955 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1956 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1957 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1958 | | | | | | | 14.3 | | | | | | |
| | 1959 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waterford-Mechanicsville-Stillwater..... | 1955 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1956 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1957 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1958 | | | | | | | | | | 11.9 | | | |
| | 1959 | | | 13.8 | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Division of Employment, Department of Labor, State of New York. Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor. Annual averages calculated from these data.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 27, 1959]

BELEAGUERED BUFFALO—CITY LANGUISHES DEEP IN RECESSION AS MOST OF UNITED STATES HEADS UPWARD—FACTORS PRODUCTIVITY GAINS, SLOW HARD GOODS RISE—CITY SEEKS TO DIVERSIFY—NO EASTER FINERY FOR COGANS

(By Joseph M. Guilfoyle)

BUFFALO.—"I've been hackin' in this town for 39 years and this is the worst business I've ever seen," the taxi driver shoots back over his shoulder as he expertly threads the cab through the rush-hour traffic along busy Delaware Avenue. Turning to his passenger, while waiting for a red light to change, he quips: "They can give this town back to the Indians as far as I'm concerned."

While the caddy may be unduly pessimistic, there nevertheless is plenty of justification for gloom in this sprawling industrial city on the shores of Lake Erie. At a time when most of the country is heading back toward prosperity, the Niagara frontier area is worse off than at any time in the past dozen years.

Buffalo is only one of the Nation's economic trouble spots, to be sure. Others include the city of Detroit and most of the State of West Virginia. But Detroit's troubles are closely linked to the auto industry and West Virginia's problems are largely those of the coal-mining industry. A close look at Buffalo points up some of the reasons why even a many-industry city can remain in a recession amid general economic recovery.

There's no question Buffalo's troubles are severe. Approximately 64,000 persons—12 percent of the work force—are unemployed. This compares with less than 7 percent for the Nation as a whole and equals Detroit's jobless percentage.

RELIEF ROLLS GROW

Home relief rolls grow fast as unemployment insurance benefit exhaustions hit a weekly rate of more than 500. For instance, in January (latest figures available) the number of people receiving home relief assistance—the public assistance category most sensitive to unemployment—totaled 15,034, more than double a year ago and the largest figure since 1942, according to Paul F. Burke, Erie County welfare commissioner.

Some 19,000 residents of Erie County, in which Buffalo is located, are dependent upon Federal rations of surplus butter, cornmeal,

dried milk, and flour to augment their meager food supplies.

More rental dwelling units are available now than at any time in the past 15 or 20 years, reports J. C. Donovan, of the Niagara Frontier Builders Association. "Even offering them at rents below ceiling levels doesn't seem to help," he adds.

"Conditions today are worse than they were in either the 1953-54 or 1949-50 recessions," states Leo A. Sweeney, superintendent of the New York Department of Labor's employment division here. "The cutback in job openings is general throughout the area," he adds.

OUTLOOK IS BLEAK

And the outlook for the months ahead apparently is just as bleak. "The Niagara Frontier area will go into the first half of 1960 with a fairly large number of persons out of work," Mr. Sweeney forecasts.

"Frankly, we are quite worried about the situation," concedes William Lawless, Jr., president of the Buffalo City Council.

Somber as the picture is, there are a few encouraging bright spots. Department store sales in the Buffalo metropolitan area so far this year are running about 5 percent ahead of last year. New car registrations in December (latest figures available) were slightly above a year ago. New house sales in January and February were 22 percent ahead of last year. But these silvers of cheer cannot minimize the seriousness of the area's plight.

Why is Buffalo so slow in throwing off the recession? The answer is a complex one but perhaps the biggest single factor is the dominant role occupied by heavy durable goods industries in the area's economy. Durable goods producers, for example, account for 65 percent of all employment in manufacturing industries.

LITTLE IMPROVEMENT

And with the exception of the steel producers here most heavy goods manufacturers—machinery and equipment, auto parts, foundries and metal fabricating—have experienced relatively little improvement in their operations.

Even in the local steel industry where operations now have regained the prerecession peak, the recovery hasn't resulted in the rehiring of all laid-off workers. At Bethlehem's Lackawanna works, for instance, where 33 of 35 open hearth furnaces are operating, some 18,000 workers are on the job. This compares with employment of

20,000 in the summer of 1957 when a similar number of furnaces were lighted.

"There are many, many idle steelworkers who won't go back to work in the mills because of the introduction of new methods, new machines, and the combining of jobs during the recession," states Joseph P. Molony, New York director of the United Steelworkers.

The problem of automation or increased productivity, Mr. Molony asserts, is certain to be discussed when the Steelworkers Union meets with industry representatives this spring to draw up a new contract. "You just don't need the same amount of people to produce more," he says, adding: "I wouldn't be surprised if 10 to 20 percent of those now out of work become permanent technological unemployed."

A somewhat similar view is expressed by George F. Rand, Jr., vice president of Marine Trust Co., and president of the Buffalo Redevelopment Foundation, Inc. "Industry is continuing to improve its efficiency with the result that not all furloughed workers are rehired when business picks up," he states.

Adding to Buffalo's unemployment woes is the loss of some 4,500 to 5,000 jobs during the past year due to the shifting or outright closing of several plants. For example, a Ford assembly plant closed its doors and set up operations in Lorain, Ohio. Result: Some 1,200 workers joined the ranks of the unemployed.

An additional 400 to 500 jobs were lost when lack of orders forced Pullman Co. to close its factory here. The plant mostly repaired and rebuilt railroad sleeping cars. Shuttering of Aluminum Co.'s magnesium foundry swelled the unemployment roles by another 300.

BIGGEST CASUALTY

Especially hard hit by the lack of defense work is the aircraft industry. The biggest casualty in this group is Bell Aircraft's Buffalo facility, where employment has dropped from 15,900 in January 1957, to around 4,500 at present. The severe shrinkage is due, in part, to the phasing out of two defense programs in the second half of last year.

A Bell spokesman suggests that employment might go even lower, although the company anticipates some new contracts which might stabilize the work force around present levels.

This is small comfort, however, to the thousands of job hunters who vainly search

for gainful employment. Talk, for example, to John Cogan, who was laid off at Bell last December.

"I'm not proud, I'll take any job," says the soft-spoken Mr. Cogan, who averaged \$7,000 a year at Bell.

Father of six—they range in age from 18 months to 9 years—and expecting a seventh child next month, he explains matter-of-factly: "With six kids and a \$9,000 mortgage, it's impossible to meet expenses with my unemployment insurance payments. We're digging into the kids' educational fund—I had been putting \$12 a week into it—at the rate of \$300 to \$350 a month to make ends meet. The only money we spend now is for shoes for the children and food. There are no more steaks on the table; we're eating stews and hamburgers now."

NO NEW BONNETS

There will be no new Easter bonnets for the Cogan brood this year. "If they get anything, it'll be hand-me-downs," says Mr. Cogan with a trace of sadness in his voice. "I never thought we'd come to that," he adds.

"I don't know what we'd have done if my wife hadn't found a job," relates Ellsworth C. Thomas, who was laid off about a year ago during a retrenchment at the local Sears, Roebuck store.

Father of three youngsters, the 34-year-old Mr. Thomas has exhausted his unemployment insurance benefits (39 weeks) and has been working at odd jobs to keep the family together. "It's tough," he says. "Our savings are practically exhausted and we had to sell the family car because it got too expensive to operate. I'm a native of Buffalo but I wouldn't hesitate a minute to take a job out of town if I could get one."

Even less fortunate is Frank Guevara, a draftsman who lost his job with an oxygen equipment maker last December. The recipient of \$45 a week from unemployment insurance on which he struggles to support his wife and two children, Mr. Guevara wonders out loud:

"How can you live on that? We had some savings—not much—but they're gone now. We bought a house 7 months ago and I wonder where the money's coming from to meet the mortgage payments."

"Like lots of other people I know around here we've really had to pull in our belts. The wife and I used to go to the movies, maybe once a week. Now if we go out we visit friends—it doesn't cost anything. Most of the time we stay home and watch TV or read the papers. And I'll tell you another thing: On 45 bucks you can't have any banquets. We've had to cut down on the food."

MAKING THE ROUNDS

Mr. Guevara makes the rounds daily in search of work, but so far the hunt has been in vain. "To tell you the truth, I've been all over the place, but I can't find a thing. Everybody just says they hope things will open up in the spring. I sure hope so. I just got to get something," he adds grimly.

While these Buffalo residents may be willing to take any job, either in the Buffalo area or elsewhere, local officials are sure there are many others who are a good deal less eager to go back to work. Some, especially those without large families to support, simply become accustomed to unemployment compensation and deliberately take their time in hunting new jobs. Others who drew high wages and overtime pay in prosperity are reluctant to take less-skilled and lower paying jobs now.

Some workers are leaving the Buffalo area to seek jobs elsewhere. But others are bound to Buffalo by family and social ties and hesitate to move. Still others would like to move but lack adequate information as to available jobs. Mistakes can be costly. Some out-of-work West Virginia miners, for

example, in recent months have traveled to equally troubled Detroit to hunt—unsuccessfully—for work.

What can be done to provide jobs for idle Buffalonians?

A number of suggestions have been put forth by the Buffalo Full Employment Committee, appointed by Mayor Frank A. Sedita last year to explore the problem.

To provide immediate employment, the committee recommends that the city speed up construction of its already approved capital improvement projects. These include schools, roads, bridges, and park improvements. City Council President Lawless states that three school projects now at the site-acquisition stage should move into construction this year.

WANTED: DEFENSE CONTRACTS

The committee also proposes that industry and Government leaders push a drive to obtain more defense contracts for the area. Civic leaders have been deeply disappointed by the amount of defense contracts awarded to manufacturers in the Niagara frontier area during the past year. In the first 6 months of 1958, the latest period for which figures are available, local firms received military contracts totaling \$59 million. Local officials think this area should have received a bigger share of the \$887 million of awards to New York State firms during the same period.

There is considerable feeling here that local manufacturers are losing out on defense contracts because they cannot bid as low as those located elsewhere. Indeed, military procurement officers have made it known that unit costs of production in the Niagara Frontier area are out of line with those of other sectors.

"Defense contractors must introduce modern, efficient machinery and use efficient management methods to lower the cost on defense production and do everything possible to improve deliveries to match the promises they make," asserts the Full Employment Committee.

Some observers believe the problem is more deep-seated than that. Dr. Austin S. Murphy, dean of the School of Business Administration at Canisius College and chairman of the chamber of commerce's economic affairs committee, contends that the changing character of military planning will have a continuing effect on plants in the Buffalo area.

PROTOTYPE OPERATIONS

"The rapid rate of technology in modern ordinance," he warns, "has forced defense industries into prototype operations instead of production. Production for stockpiling is out for the foreseeable future in aircraft and missiles," he says. This, Dr. Murphy contends, is bad news for production workers.

The long-range solution to Buffalo's unemployment problem, observers argue, must come from the diversification of its industry so that it will not lean so heavily on the durable goods producers. "I'd like to see some food processors and consumer goods manufacturers set up operations here," declares Robert E. Rich, chairman of the full employment committee and president of Rich Products Corp., a dairy processor here.

Even diversification may not solve the unemployment problem. "The character of our industry is changing from a semiskilled society to a highly technical one," observes the Marine Trust Co.'s Mr. Rand. "In the new economy the mass production employee will have a reduced role. What we need most now are engineers and physicists—fellows with Ph. D.'s and masters degrees."

"TOO MANY QUICKIE STRIKES"

Attracting new manufacturers to the area won't be easy either, in the opinion of many businessmen. "Buffalo's labor reputation is not good," states one prominent industrialist. "There are too many quickie strikes, too

much featherbedding, too many coffee breaks and the work tempo is unfavorable. All this is hurting us now. It's pretty hard to recommend this section to new manufacturers under these conditions. Before any company comes here, it will want to be sure that it gets its money's worth," he adds.

Indeed, there are signs the city may have difficulty keeping what industry it has. A small furniture maker, considering shifting to the South, complains that in 1940-41 one unit of production required 5 man-hours of labor; today a comparable unit takes 12.85 man-hours to produce. The prevailing hourly rate in this plant is \$2.56, plus fringe benefits estimated at another 20 cents.

"Similar workers in Mississippi," observes a spokesman for the company, "get \$1.25 to \$1.30 an hour, with negligible fringe benefits. Under these conditions we figure we could ship our product into the Buffalo market and sell it for less than we do now, even after allowing for the added transportation costs."

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate next week.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ZELENO), for Wednesday, May 27, on account of official business.

Mr. JACKSON, for 10 days, on account of official business, Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter and tables.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow, vacating her special order for today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL.

Mr. TOLLEFSON.

Mr. MEADER, his remarks made during general debate today and to include extraneous matter.

At the request of Mr. QUIE, the following Members to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 19. An act to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 28, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1029. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1030. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the negotiation of target prices under Department of the Air Force contracts with General Precision Laboratory, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y., for certain radar systems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1031. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relative to an application for a loan of \$1,327,000 to the Jackson Valley Irrigation District at Ione, Calif., pursuant to the act of June 5, 1957 (71 Stat. 48); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1032. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1033. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1034. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6190. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and

Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 28. Resolution to continue in effect House Resolution 90 and House Resolution 386, 83d Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3088. A bill to amend sections 353 and 354 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7155. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 7401. A bill to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 7402. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 7403. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 7404. A bill to fix midnight as the effective time of discharges from the Armed Forces prior to January 1, 1957, for the purposes of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 7405. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of a pension of \$100 per month to World War I veterans who have attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 7406. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7407. A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 7408. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 7409. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the States to make refunds of the Federal tax on gasoline in cases where such gasoline is used on a farm for farming purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7411. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7412. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 7413. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide employee protection in cases involving consolidations, mergers, and other similar situations of passenger motor carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7414. A bill to amend section 210a(a) and section 210a(b) of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to deny the granting of temporary operating authority to render common or contract passenger service by motor vehicle if absence of service results from a strike; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.R. 7415. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to consent, on behalf of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, to a modification of the terms of the trust instrument executed by James B. Wilbur; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7416. A bill to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to a compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey for the creation of the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.J. Res. 404. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to a compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey for the creation of the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the depressed domestic mining and mineral industries affecting public and other lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress

of the United States relative to bill No. 908, providing for a direct Representative of the Virgin Islands in the Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 7417. A bill for the relief of William P. Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H.R. 7418. A bill for the relief of Monti Marine Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7419. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Pallini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7420. A bill for the relief of Marija Toic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 7421. A bill for the relief of Emiliano Rodriguez also known as Juan Bautista Hidalgo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 7422. A bill for the relief of Olinda David Borgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7423. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Giuseppe Agrusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 7424. A bill for the relief of Badia Ibrahim Machoul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7425. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Humiko Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 7426. A bill for the relief of Simon N. Bassous and Mary Nicola Bassous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

200. By Mr. DOOLEY: Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of New Rochelle, N.Y., May 20, 1959, urging Congress to adopt a bill providing for reimbursement to municipalities for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

201. By Mr. DOOLEY: Petition of the Westchester Committee for Sane Nuclear Policy, White Plains, N.Y., and supporters in the general area, applauding the introduction of House Resolution 234 and urging the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress to pass a resolution giving strong backing to the President of the United States in his determination to effect a working agreement among all countries for the discontinuance of nuclear bomb testing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a great many parents all over the country are grateful that the TV Academy chose Miss Loretta Young for one of its coveted awards this year. Her program of April 26, 1959, was an outstanding moral, social, and civic contribution. It portrayed vividly an alarming criminal consequence of the sale of obscene literature on newsstands; it also demonstrated the need for community-wide participation in the drive to clean up the printed material available to American youth.

The general public as well as the television industry is indebted to Miss Young for her superb performance in behalf of decency. Realizing the urgent need for exposing irresponsible newsdealers, producers of that show have expertly dramatized the problem a second time. Another effective use would be to make prints of the film for use at meetings of parent-teachers organizations, veterans' groups, and various civic clubs.

The story emphasized that society is to blame if news vendors flaunt the laws of decency by putting salacious literature up for sale. Every adult who has any love whatsoever for his family, his neighbor's children, his community, and his country should ponder Miss Young's observation that "we are going to pay an awful price for it" unless the situation is remedied.

Anyone who is resigned to believing that the practice cannot be stopped should become acquainted with what is taking place in my district. Individuals and organizations alike have begun to demand a cleanup of newsstands, with the result that guilty newsdealers have been notified that they must cease peddling filth or be prosecuted. Dis-

tributors serving the area have agreed to stop serving obscene material, not only to stands, but to outlets throughout the district.

The same vigilance is required to halt activities of direct mail houses that violate the sanctity of homes and solicit children. Parents who find that lewd material is coming through the mail have a duty to society as well as to their own boys and girls to report the offenses to their local postmasters, and other postal authorities.

Last year, Congress strengthened the law to simplify prosecution of traffickers of foul and filthy printed material. How communities may implement the law is being demonstrated in several areas of my district, and I take this opportunity to congratulate all participants for their forthright courage and duty.

Results of Poll Taken in the New Sixth Congressional District of Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed a questionnaire to about 52,000 residents of my congressional district. It contained 12 questions dealing with issues pending before this Congress. To date there has been a better than average response to such questionnaires. Although more returns are to be expected, a sufficient number have now been received to determine the general views of the people of my area. The results of the poll expressed in terms of percentages are as follows:

1. Do you support the President in his efforts to achieve a balanced budget? Yes, 91 percent; no, 9 percent.

2. If the budget for fiscal 1960 is not balanced, would you favor increasing taxes to eliminate the deficit? Yes, 36 percent; no, 64 percent.

3. Do you favor continuance of our mutual security (foreign aid) program? If yes, at present cost (40 percent); at reduced cost (55 percent); at increased cost (5 percent). Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

4. Do you approve of our firm stand with respect to Berlin? Yes, 96 percent; no, 4 percent.

5. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations? Yes, 21 percent; no, 79 percent.

6. Should the United States engage in trade with Red China? Yes, 31 percent; no, 69 percent.

7. Would you favor increasing the highway gasoline tax by 1½ cents to put the Federal highway building program on a self-supporting basis? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

8. Should the social security law be broadened to include medical services, to be financed by increased contributions by individuals and employers? Yes, 49.6 percent; no, 50.4 percent.

9. Do you favor Federal aid for local school construction? Yes, 42 percent; no, 58 percent.

10. Should the Federal Government continue its program of financial assistance for local airport construction? Yes, 33 percent; no, 67 percent.

11. Would you favor a law calling for a secret ballot in the election or removal of union officials, and in other vital union matters? Yes, 93 percent; no, 7 percent.

12. Do you believe that the Government should continue its farm price support program? Yes, 18 percent; no, 82 percent.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, independence and freedom had been the national aspiration of the Armenian people

suffering under alien conquerors in their homeland. For centuries they had cherished this dream; though well aware of the almost insuperable difficulties in attaining their national goal without effective aid from friends and sympathizers abroad, still they nursed the idea as part of their spiritual nourishment. The more they were oppressed by their overlords, and the more they suffered under unbearable conditions, the more fervently they clung to the idea, and only in its realization they sought their salvation. And toward the end of the First World War, at a terrible cost in human lives, they had their reward within their grasp.

During that war about 1 million Armenians had lost their lives in Turkish massacres, but many hundred thousands who survived that holocaust escaped to the Caucasus, joined their kinsmen in a northeast corner of historic Armenia there, and proclaimed their independence on May 28, 1918. That was 41 years ago, and since then the independence thus attained has vanished into the dreamland again. After enjoying the sweetness and blessings of free and independent life, unhappy Armenians were to fight for their freedom in a hopeless, life-and-death struggle against both Turkish nationalist forces and Communist Russia's Red Army. The unfortunate end came early in December of 1920. When the country was overrun by the enemy forces, part of it was retained by the Turks while in another part a Soviet type of government was instituted under the direct control of the Kremlin.

Today for more than 38 years the Soviet regime rules over Armenia as one of its 16 constituent republics. There all vestiges of freedom are banned, and collectivization as well as regimentation has been in full swing. The people have been enduring under this totalitarian dictatorship and at the same time hoping and praying for their freedom. On the anniversary celebration of Armenian Independence Day, we echo their genuine feelings and hope that they will be rewarded in their expectation.

Unification of Military Procurement and Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1959, I called to the attention of the Members of the House the contents of a letter which I addressed to the Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Hon. Raymond J. Saulnier, regarding the need for forceful action toward unification of military procurement and supply not only for the sake of defense itself but to relieve the economy of the inflationary pressures which are now being exerted upon it.

On May 22 I again wrote to Mr. Saulnier on "How do we get hold of this problem?" and I wish to have it inserted in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1959.

HON. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER,
Council of Economic Advisers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SAULNIER: Reference is made to your letter of May 5, 1959, in response to mine of April 8, 1959.

I am in complete agreement with the implication of your question, "How do we get hold of this problem?" In other words, this matter has been studied and restudied and what is needed now is a program of positive action.

As I stated in my previous letter, the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Department of Defense Reorganization Act, 1958, gives the Secretary of Defense broad authority "for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate."

It has been estimated that the supply and service activities or support activities take the major portion of the annual budget and besides this, we have the enormous inventories and facilities of the various military services all over the world.

When the Department of Defense Reorganization Act, Public Law 85-599, was before the House of Representatives on June 12, 1958, Congressman McCormack listed a number of supply and service activities which fall within the scope of the amendment. Some months ago, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense and asked that he list all the activities which would fall within the scope of the amendment and to advise with respect to each just what action had been taken or was contemplated. I understand that Senators DOUGLAS, LAUSCHE, and perhaps others have written similar letters but have had no response to date.

It is my firm conviction that a topside action committee should be constituted to operate at the Presidential level to set up time schedules for the fulfillment of a number of programs which have been on dead center for a long time. I would include the following as a start:

1. Schedule the transfer of common-use administrative or commercial-type supply and services to GSA as contemplated by the GSA Act which is now 10 years old. This will involve the transfer of facilities and personnel with the activities.

2. Evaluate the present single manager plans for (a) subsistence and clothing, (b) petroleum products, (c) medical supply and if basically successful, streamline them and extend the plans to other classes of items. Also determine if they should be combined into a system of general military supply depots.

3. Consolidate and streamline surplus property disposal including the donable program.

4. Make provision for a property inventory control system which will permit a review of existing common items in all the military inventories before additional orders are placed.

5. Institute a genuine action program to develop to the maximum standardization of supply items, form procedures, systems, reporting, accounting, etc. (For example there should be a discontinuance of special service insignia on blankets and other items of common supply which prevent excesses from being transferred to other agencies. Recently, the Marine Corps declared 260,000 blankets excess but as they bore special insignia, the other services did not want them.)

6. Make a speedy determination as to when stock funds should and should not be used.

In order to get a running start on the overall program, I recommend that the Hoover task force committee be utilized as an advisory committee to assist a special action task force. The Hoover task force members, as you know, have spent long periods of time studying these matters, are wholly objective in their views and were carefully chosen in the first place because of their competence in the respective fields.

The importance of these matters in their economic impact on the country is related to there being in effective existence a streamlined, efficient, and economical supply system. Little or no use has apparently been made of the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 which was designed to provide all necessary legislative authority. Real action thus is an executive responsibility.

Since the Department of Defense is making such unsatisfactory progress under its own volition, I suggest the appropriateness of the Bureau of the Budget, in its capacity as the management arm for the President, being directed to establish such internal organization in the Bureau as is necessary to really take hold of this matter and accomplish the results—and benefits—which have so clearly been blueprinted as attainable.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

DAV Services in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Florida citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Florida, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx; DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran very substantially. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

DAV ORGANIZATION

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving

monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV maintains three NSO's in Florida—Mr. Albert Cuervo, Mr. Robert Brogan, and Mr. Charles N. Girard located in the VA regional office, Post Office Box 1437, St. Petersburg. The VA hospitals coming under the jurisdiction of this office are: a 450-bed general medical hospital at Coral Gables, a 516-bed general medical hospital at Bay Pines, a 729-bed hospital—DOM—at Bay Pines and a 354-bed general medical hospital at Lake City.

NEW VETERANS' HOSPITALS

It is noteworthy, in discussing veterans' hospitals in Florida, that the Veterans' Administration approved and the President authorized the construction of some 814 additional general, medical, and surgical and neuropsychiatric beds during the last 2 years, 350 for Bay Pines, 350 for Coral Gables, and 114 for Lake City. A large share of the credit goes to the veterans organizations, including the DAV, that have fought for so many years for a recognition by the VA that Florida's veteran influx has been and will continue to mount so rapidly that it is essential new bed authorizations be made. Florida is a veteran impacted State and many of us in Congress have been fighting along with veterans' organizations in Florida to get the VA to realize this.

This improved hospital program for Florida includes the construction of a new 800-bed hospital at Coral Gables, an additional 500-bed hospital at Bay Pines, and the renovation of existing facilities at Lake City to accommodate 114 additional beds.

The department commander, Mr. Robert T. Kelly, 482 Perrine Avenue, Perrine, is chairman for the DAV's national convention to be held in the Hotel Deauville, Miami Beach, during the week beginning August 16, 1959. The department adjutant is Mr. Horace E. Johnson, Post Office Box 567, Jacksonville, Fla. Mr. Miles H. Draper, First National Bank Building, Tampa, a long-time friend of mine, is 1 of the 12 trustees of the DAV Service Foundation and was its president and chairman of its board of trustees from 1949 to 1957.

VETERANS' BENEFITS AND SERVICES

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out \$146,511,000 for its veteran program in Florida, including \$46,778,-

453 disability compensation to its 53,356 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Florida furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

Only about 8 percent—4,440—are members of the 59 DAV chapters in Florida.

This 8 percent membership is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of Florida veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Claimants contacted (estimate)..... | 66,769 |
| Claims folders reviewed..... | 55,641 |
| Appearances before rating boards..... | 31,994 |
| Compensation increases obtained..... | 4,638 |
| Service connections obtained..... | 1,604 |
| Nonservice pensions..... | 1,411 |
| Death benefits obtained..... | 138 |
| Total monetary benefits obtained..... | \$3,551,662.46 |

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of \$20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of \$5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Florida veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits and multifarious other problems.

FAIR TREATMENT FOR VETERAN ASKED

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too

many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims that it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than \$28 million per year. About 2.6 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred to disabled veterans in Florida with a consequent loss of about \$738,000 per year. I have joined with the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in introducing legislation to make sure the disabled veteran gets a fair break in these review cases and in holding hearings on such cases in Florida recently.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Florida to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about \$12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about \$3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about \$8.80 for each rating board appearance, or again, about \$22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about \$123 for each service connection obtained, or about \$54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about \$14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

DAV SERVICES RENDERED

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Identito-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identito-Tag department, 12,238 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Florida residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating \$3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another \$100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100, equivalent to about \$5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Florida by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such "serviced" claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is \$100—\$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

Down With Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Tribune-Democrat, published in Johnstown, Pa., joined the Chicago Tribune and other newspapers in a unique campaign to urge Congress to eliminate unnecessary spending in the Federal Government. Since then, I have received scores of messages from readers who are deeply concerned with Federal policies and practices that are the basic reason for inflation and which will bring eventual bankruptcy to the Nation unless checked and reversed.

The newspapers and the citizens responding to this patriotic movement are to be congratulated. Since coming to Congress, I have been an incessant foe of extravagance with U.S. Treasury funds, but somehow the number of economy minded Representatives and Senators has not prevailed except for a very short period. Under the demands of an irate citizenry, I am hopeful that even Members with the most burning penchant for spending tax dollars will begin to tighten the reins on runaway inflation. The place to start is right here in Congress when the appropriation bills are under consideration; only if the Government lives within the limits of its income will our dollar retain its value.

Deficit spending, except in extreme emergencies, is immoral. It leaves to future generations the debts incurred by wastrels of preceding eras. For a while there was no immediate visible evidence to contradict the preachments of political imposters who insisted that "it makes

no difference if we have a big national debt—we owe it all to ourselves." This spurious but appealing reasoning was repeated over and over as the presses printed more and more dollars for use in any number of paternalistic ventures and for distribution to friends and enemies all over the world. U.S. Government money began to flow like water, and everyone was offered a drink.

Now, at long last, the past is catching up. The water is fast losing strength. The bureaucrats who opened the spigots have plenty of victuals for themselves, but the people who pay their way are finding that they have been sold down the river that erodes the value of their incomes. Pensioners have been cheated; men and women who saved for retirement have had their nest evaporate in an atmosphere of Federal extravagance; the average worker who has been fortunate enough to enjoy wage increases finds that he is in truth standing still economically; and those whose incomes remain the same are slipping to lower living standards.

National debt makes no difference? If there is anyone still supporting that theory, perhaps he would like to explain away the \$7,600 million interest that was paid on the national debt in fiscal 1958. That money came from taxes. In the hands of the Nation's taxpayers, it could have bought upwards of half a million \$15,000 homes; or 3 million automobiles selling for \$2,500 each; or paid \$4,570 toward college tuition and expenses of every boy and girl who will be graduated from high school this year.

Mr. Speaker, if the American public had an extra \$7½ billion to spend as it chooses, there would be no need for depressed area legislation or other projects that are contemplated for reviving the economy. More new houses and new cars would put new demands on coal, steel, glass, tools, plastics, ceramics, pottery, railroads, and the many other industries that must keep running at high levels of operation if a sound economic structure is to be maintained.

We are not pointing in the direction of economic stability if deficit spending is continued. The job of the Federal Government is to return to a sound monetary basis and to start cutting down on the national debt. Inflation is deadly poisonous. The only antidote is an integrious money policy to be administered by the Federal Government.

Conversion of Saline and Brackish Waters to Fresh Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 25, the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, addressed the Sixth National Watershed Congress. This meeting was one of the

most enjoyable events that I have attended during this session of Congress. Secretary Seaton's address on the subject of conversion of saline and brackish waters to fresh water was one of the most interesting and constructive talks that it has been my privilege to hear on this particular subject. It is replete with up-to-date information which should be valuable to every Member of Congress. It is my pleasure to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where its values may be preserved and those interested may have access to it:

As participants in this Sixth National Watershed Congress, you and I join in our dedication to the continuing cause of water conservation.

We know that the availability of water—just plain, ordinary water—is rapidly becoming a major concern to America and the world. In fact, as early as 1975-80, it may be our number one domestic problem.

The facts indicate the accuracy of such a conclusion.

American industries, farms, and homes are today calling for an ever-rising tide of water.

Our population is growing by one person every 11 seconds, by 330 every hour, by 8,000 every day, by a quarter of a million every month. We now number 175 million. By 1980, just 21 years away, there will be nearly 275 million of us. By the year 2000 (and I remind you that however remote that date may sound, it is only 41 years away), we may well double our present population and number 350 million souls.

Presently, we use about 240 billion gallons of water a day. In 20 years our needs will demand at least 500 or 600 billion gallons—nearly two or three times as much—if we have it available.

This is nothing to panic about, but it is a matter of real concern—one which leaves us no choice other than to continue our current conservation progress and to plan wisely and imaginatively for the years ahead.

Many areas will continue to get from conventional sources all the water they need in the foreseeable future. Fresh water we haven't even begun to touch in our conservation programs now flows in wasteful abundance into the sea. Surprisingly enough, even after a century of conservation, we are using only about one-third of the water that courses to the ocean from the 17 Western States, and only about one-eighth of the supply in the East.

Thankfully, we are making progress gradually but steadily in capturing and using a bigger and bigger percentage of this flow. In addition to efforts of individual farmers—and they are doing more for themselves than ever before—all branches of Government, are sharing in the task. For instance, in fiscal 1959, the Federal Government is investing in land and water conservation and development \$1,714 million; in fiscal 1960, the administration proposes an overall program of \$1,917 million.

One day, though, and sooner than many people think, we shall have to follow a new trail for our water supply, at least for certain areas. That trail leads both to huge known supplies of brackish water inland and also to the inexhaustible oceans and seas of the world.

Getting the salt out of sea water, to be sure, is nothing new. Sailors have done that for centuries. Today the crews of the atomic submarines *Nautilus*, *Skate*, and *Seawolf* drink water converted by heat from their atomic reactors. In fact, like Julius Caesar and the ancient Phoenicians, people generally know how to turn sea water into fresh: just distill it. The basic science is as old as recorded history. But what we're still

searching for is the answer to the question: how do you do this on a large scale at a cost cheap enough to substitute for water from conventional sources?

Presently operated salt water conversion plants do the job all right, but their costs are high. Sheer necessity, not competitive advantage, has caused them to be built, particularly in recent years.

On the arid island of Aruba in the Caribbean, for example, people are drinking and the oil industry is using $3\frac{1}{2}$ million gallons of converted sea water a day. The cost is about \$1.75 per thousand gallons, compared to the District of Columbia's minimum rate of 26 cents per thousand.

The people on the island of St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands would also like to be using converted water (though the price may differ). And they will be, once their conversion plant, authorized last September, is built. No wonder they're interested. Because their population has outstripped their water supply, their alternative is to go all the way to Puerto Rico and haul potable water by barge, at a cost of nearly \$5 per thousand gallons. The Virgin Islands Government reports that in fiscal year 1958 it spent on this operation nearly \$177,000.

Consider another example: Coalinga, a small community in California.

For years its people had to haul in their drinking water at a cost of \$7 per 1,000 gallons; when they got tired of that expense, they cut the bill to \$1.45 per thousand gallons, and their town made U.S. history by becoming the first to get its drinking water supply from converted brackish well water.

Further south in California, people aren't that desperate yet, though they are indeed hard-pressed.

Years ago, Los Angeles and southern California had to dig and tunnel the Colorado River Aqueduct 250 miles across deserts and through mountains to drain fresh water out of the Colorado River. That undertaking, once criticized as a gigantic waste, has long since proved its feasibility. Even so it will be inadequate to the needs in 10 years or sooner.

So today the people of southern California are looking toward another answer to their problem, a \$1½ billion project which would bring them water from the Feather River—more than 500 miles away—water far more expensive than that now obtained from the Colorado.

In California, as in many other places east and inbetween, new supplies of natural fresh water will surely become more expensive in the years ahead and the supply available will be less than needed. Our hope is that just as surely the cost of converting saline water to fresh will come down. In one community after another, as I foresee the future, these cost curves will one day cross, and then converted sea water will be the less expensive of the two; in some localities it will be the only reliable source.

Of course, for some towns there is just one curve, one price, and one choice: Pay the bill, suffer stagnation of growth, or move out. Their water supplies are running out and no more is in sight.

The goal of the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior is to help forestall any such disasters by developing processes to make tremendous quantities of converted water available and bring the conversion cost curve down. In that work, we enjoy full cooperation with private enterprise, colleges, universities, and the scientists of more than 16 nations of the world.

The saline water conversion program was authorized by Congress in 1952—just 7 years ago. In that span of time, the curve of comparative cost has gone down faster and further than in all previous human history.

Consider where we were as recently as the late thirties: Then it cost between \$4 and \$5 to convert 1,000 gallons of sea water to fresh.

Meanwhile equipment, fuel, and labor costs have gone up, and between 1939 and 1952 inflation shrunk the dollar into a 50-cent piece. In spite of all that, the cost of saline water conversion has been cut by more than half. In the most effective existing seawater conversion plants, it is now about \$1.75 per thousand gallons.

The Government's saline-water investigation began with laboratory research. Next it included small pilot plants. Now it is about to move on to the building of large demonstration plants.

This year, 1959, the program stands in the wings of a new and larger stage; where, for the first time, we are quite hopeful of breaking the dollar-per-thousand gallons barrier.

For that, we have farseeing members of both major political parties and dedicated scientists to thank, as well as such organizations as yours.

Last September 2, President Eisenhower approved Public Law 85-883. The bill was sponsored by Senators CLINTON ANDERSON, LYNDON JOHNSON, FRANCIS CASE, THOMAS KUCHEL, and ALEXANDER WILEY. The companion bill in the House was sponsored by Congressman HOLIFIELD, and similar bills were introduced by Representatives WILSON, ENGLE, ROOSEVELT, KING, TEAGUE of California, and RHODES of Arizona.

This new law authorizes the Department of the Interior to construct and operate five saline water conversion demonstration plants.

Three will be designed to produce fresh water out of water from the sea. One plant is to be located on the east coast, one on the west, and one on the gulf. Two are to be designed to turn out more than a million gallons of potable water a day.

In addition, there will be two plants for the treatment of inland brackish water, one located in the Southwest and one in the northern Great Plains. One is to have a capacity of 250,000 gallons per day or more.

On of the advice of three scientific consultants to the Department—Dr. Ralph Morgan of Purdue University, Dudley F. Phelps, a New York industrial engineer, and Capt. Ivan Monk of the U.S. Navy—I have selected a new process for the first million-gallon-per-day demonstration plant. It is known as long-tube vertical multiple-effect distillation, developed jointly by the Office of Saline Water and the late W. L. Badger of Ann Arbor, Mich. Pilot plant tests of this process indicate a major breakthrough in the control of salt scale, a breakthrough which obviates the need for using acid or high cost alloys to control scale, thus substantially cutting costs.

Potable water can be produced in this new plant, we believe, for less than \$1 per thousand gallons—less, in other words, than the current price of fresh water in Key West, Fla. Moreover, as the size of the plant increases, we can expect the price per gallon to come down perhaps to the point where a 15-20 million-gallon-per-day plant using this process may eventually convert sea water into a thousand gallons of fresh for less than 60 cents. Right across the Potomac from here, people in Alexandria are paying more than that now.

Please understand we cannot guarantee all the cost figures I am presenting to you. As a matter of fact, we hope to meet or better them; but if we were absolutely certain all factors would work out as projected, there would be little or no point in building the plants for both experimental and demonstration purposes.

In the second million-gallon-per-day demonstration plant, another process is to be used, that of multistage flash distillation.

For this plant, we are asking the Atomic Energy Commission to supply a low-temperature, low-pressure atomic reactor as the heat source. This flash distillation process also

lends itself to large-scale conversion, and with atomic heat we can reasonably expect to open a new field for the peaceful application of atomic energy.

The types of plant selected, the next question is: Where should we build them?

Last week a special board made up of consultants to the Department met to tackle that problem. Its members were Sheppard T. Powell, of Baltimore, an expert in industrial water problems; Lewis S. Finch, of Indianapolis, president of the American Water Works Association; and Dr. Wilburn C. Schroeder, professor of chemical engineering at the University of Maryland.

On the basis of their recommendations, I can say to you tonight that the first plant, using the long-tube-vertical process, will be located on the gulf and that the second plant, using flash distillation, will be on the west coast.

These areas were selected both because of their more critical need for water and their intense public interest in the saline water conversion program.

Selecting from 31 gulf coast and 18 west coast applications, I shall soon announce the exact location of these two plants.

That choice will not be an easy one. Motivated by an urgent, and in some cases by a desperate need for more water, over 150 cities in all have asked to be considered as a site for a sea or brackish water plant.

Where are these cities? Confined to a few hot and arid States in the South and Southwest? Not at all. Applications have poured in from every part of the coastal perimeter

of the United States. Of the 21 States on gulf or ocean only two—Delaware and Alabama—had no applicants.

And that fact should not arouse wonder. In 1957, you may recall, over 1,000 communities, the hometowns of one-seventh of our entire population, endured water shortages to some degree—shortages which varied from a lack of water for lawns or gardens to an actual absence of water to drink.

That is a major reason we are moving the program ahead of the schedule the Congress originally set forth.

Under the capable leadership of former Congressman A. L. Miller as Director of the Office of Saline Water, the second process for the demonstration plant program was announced almost 3 weeks ahead of schedule. The third process will be ready for announcement almost 3 months ahead of the established congressional deadline.

Looking to the future we hold the great hope that a key fact of human history is about to change: The fact that up to now nearly all the people of the world have necessarily depended for life entirely on fresh water upon and beneath the land.

Bearing in mind that an acre-foot of water amounts to 325,851 gallons, we are a long way from the day when converted sea water can profitably be used for irrigation, in competition with conventional sources—if they exist—but that is not to say it can never be done.

Once we can economically tap the oceans for fresh water, not only for human and in-

dustrial use, as now we know we can—but also for agriculture—wastelands can become gardens.

Think what that achievement would mean in sections of California and Arizona where the rainfall every year averages only 10–12 inches and the population has increased in 20 years by 55 percent; in western Mexico and lower California; in the famine-cursed "drought quadrangle" of northeastern Brazil; in vast unpopulated expanses of Africa; in Saudi Arabia, practically a sea-ringed desert; in West Pakistan; in the Negev area of Israel, an arrow-shaped desert pointing into the salty waters of the Gulf of Aqaba; or in Australia, an island continent large as the United States with no more fresh water than in the flow of our Columbia River.

From where we now stand, we can with justification gaze toward a new horizon where these lands flourish, some of them for the first time since the days of Babylon and Carthage, some for the first time in all recorded history. For the future of life on this planet, the implications in saline and brackish water conversion stagger the imagination.

Bringing blessings to Americans and to millions of people around the globe, the arrival of one or more genuinely low-cost processes can well turn out to be one of the most important scientific achievements of our time.

In this year 1959 the river of research is broadening and deepening beyond all precedent as it begins its final flow toward an estuary of triumph.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1959

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m.

Archbishop Khoren Paroyan, Armenian Prelate of Lebanon, offered the following prayer:

May Almighty God bless this great Nation whose light of freedom serves as a beacon for all the oppressed peoples of the world. We thank Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, for His divine guidance which He has bestowed upon your great leader, the President of the United States of America.

May the immortal souls of the valiant sons of this great land who fought so bravely for freedom receive God's eternal blessing. Forty-one years ago, Armenia also gave her valiant sons, so that upon this very day, May 28, 1918, a new citadel of freedom was born—the free and independent Republic of Armenia. But the locusts of communism quickly spread their darkness over this ancient island of Christendom, and Armenia became the first victim of atheistic communism.

The pestilence that ravaged Armenia knew no boundaries. It rapidly consumed more lands and more peoples, until today the light of freedom faces the enveloping darkness.

We pray to God that His divine counsel may guide the men who assemble in this great Chamber. May they stand in His light as defenders of freedom, justice, and liberty for all men.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Our Father, we beseech of Thee, support in our desire to worship, to enjoy privilege without abuse, to have liberty

without license, to have power and refuse to use it for selfish purpose, so that the experience of living will lead us and our fellows to greater spiritual reality. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1959.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GALE W. MCGEE, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MCGEE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 26, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7343) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7343) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE PROGRAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that at the conclusion of the morn-